

# THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

---

No. 1.—JANUARY—1912.

---

## I.

### A PROBLEM OF AMERICAN EDUCATION.

GARRETT W. THOMPSON, UNIVERSITY OF MAINE.

THE problem of American education has never lacked serious consideration on the part of those to whom our national institutions are objects of concern and veneration. The utterances of men high in official influence show unmistakable earnestness; the popular response as reflected in the press betrays a no less earnest attitude among those who are capable of expressing public sentiment; and many whose diffidence denies them such utterance await enlightenment with an eagerness which attests how sincere the desire is to know the truth.

It cannot be denied, however, that the general situation would be more assuring if there were greater agreement among scholars as to the normal end and aim of education itself. It is possible that these opposing views may produce a resultant, or serve by their diversity to maintain an equilibrium among educational forces. But the present uncertainty will not engender public confidence, and probably not until unity of ideal as well as uniformity of practice are reached can we expect the solution of a problem which is as vital as it is far-reaching.

No discussion of American education would be fair if it ignored the beliefs which are held by practical business men.

They have developed activities whose proportions the human mind can scarcely grasp. Begun in small things and extending through a line of continuous evolution this present greatness represents a most rational achievement. Sacrifice, frugality and enterprise have attended its development, and its attainment has been possible only by the display and use of those splendid powers which have made our republic conspicuous among the nations of the world. The pioneers of this commercial greatness had no time for personal education; they learned in the school of experience. And as the system grew more complex; as each new opportunity seemed to beget other and greater opportunities, demand on time and energy became more imperative. Men felt self-centered in their business life; success was inseparably associated with commercial values and power came to be reckoned in terms of financial units.

But if these achievements came without a college education, they were not the result of blind effort. The practical man knows clearly how he won success, and his knowledge rests on an empiricism whose claims it is difficult to oppose. Natural shrewdness of mind, good habits, tireless energy and willingness to work one's way patiently from small beginnings—these are the materials from which fortunes have been made, and from whose use certain working principles of conduct have been evolved. Men come thus to believe that experience is the best, or rather the only, teacher; that the mental powers instead of being ultra-developed by college training need only to be organized in the school of practical life; that work is to be done with the least possible loss of time and energy; that economy of time and labor means saving of expense; that these modern days demand modern methods, for which reason also the past is of little use for the purposes of imitation; that the practical ideal of life is to make a living.

If, then, the college idea enters little into this belief it is not because the practical man is insincere or superficial in his views, but only that experience, as he views it, is ample to meet life's most exacting demands and that the college graduate does not seem to possess any power or training which makes

him superior to men at large or better equipped for the world's work. Unless, therefore, the college can offer something which the young man cannot get elsewhere, and something which greatly enhances his value and efficiency as a worker, a college education is not necessary to the attainment of success.

On the other hand, the college idea assumes the necessity of education and offers its courses to those who seek preparation for life. The curriculum was formerly arranged according to the principle that such preparation required the maximum cultural breadth, which was to be found only in a study of the Latin and Greek classics, or rather which could not be realized without them. This view has in later years been condemned as traditional and narrow; scientific studies are assigned a paramount value in general education. Their introduction has necessitated ample laboratory facilities and greatly changed the general character of the college idea. Supplementary to the scientific propaganda has been the growth of interest in modern languages, preëminently French and German, and they have been heralded as worthy and capable of representing and serving the spirit of culture which was so long thought to be the sole prerogative of the old humanities. The influx of the new studies has in later years greatly crowded the curriculum and placed more courses at the disposal of the student than he could possibly use. To offset this congestion the elective system was promulgated and the hope entertained that he could be trained thus to select materials for a broad education in a manner which would do justice to his individual needs and temperament. This multiplication of courses and departments has complicated the college idea, and it must be confessed that over against the ideal of the practical man the college presents a view which lacks the convincing power of unity.

We would find less difficulty in coördinating our notions of education and courses of instruction if the end of education were more clearly and more universally discerned. Is it intellectual proficiency? Or character? Or citizenship? Shall we train the whole man for general service? Or develop

specific powers for specific ends? Should the student choose his vocation and then converge all his lines of study toward it? Or should he seek the atmosphere of education in order that by living in it he may be led ultimately to a definite calling? The child enters the kindergarten and passes successively through the primary, grammar and high school; he spends four years at college, supplementing them with post-graduate work at the university, and then enters upon his duties in the larger world. This long scholastic experience is in no sense a preparation for life; every step is life itself. Life begins with the first conscious thinking, and kindergarten is merely that point in the student's career at which the kindergarten influence touches his destiny. The same is true of each grade in the educational process, and this relationship of scholastic influence continues as long as the student retains his connection with an institution of learning. The course of activity which he adopts after graduation is no more life than his previous experiences, but he has now become an independent personality; he no longer receives but gives, and he is valued largely by the contribution of service which he makes to his generation. It is therefore the fact of his independence of personality which leads (or misleads?) us to ascribe a paramount value to this last period of his life, and life to him is just that set or series of relationships which comprise the sum total of his experience.

If life, then, is a series of relationships, that form of education is best which anticipates the greatest number of these relationships and gives the student power to operate them with most comprehensive results. And surely that ideal of education is highest which aims to acquaint the student with what lies before him, so that he meets life's issues forearmed because forewarned. The weakness of specific training is that it enables the student to meet too few of life's relationships and leaves him to deal with many whose existence—let alone whose nature—he had not dreamed of. The danger of an absolutely general training is that it is likely to lack depth and to touch life's relationships too lightly. But we are nearest the true



ideal of education when we believe that its highest function is the interpretation of life and its relationships, and wise indeed are they who see that the greatest dangers lie in the moments of least active occupation. The laborer is harmless during his working hours. But once released what does he do? The student fits into the world's great system during the discharge of his vocation duties. But when left to his own resources, the very freedom establishes the possibility of his becoming a dangerous member of society. The engineer works conscientiously during his shift. But is he able to deal sanely with the thousand relationships which his mechanical knowledge cannot touch? It is no idle question to ask by what right we equip a student with facilities for becoming an expert in chemistry and leave untouched those relationships which have nothing to do with chemistry but everything to do with his destiny. It is true that education is not the only influence which helps to prepare students for life; there are other agencies at work which are formulative not only of character but of intellectual power as well. But they all have, must have, a common end and it would be impossible to separate them as independent factors. Meanwhile it must be true that, as he is wisest who determines most clearly his relationships, so that system of education is most complete and adequate which classifies to the student the greatest number of life's relationships.

Human thought demands system. That which is isolated we do not understand. Only those things which are related to each other have a meaning to us. And that is only another way of saying that things which are related to each other must find their ultimate unity in system. The insane man has separate states of consciousness which cannot be coördinated; hence insanity deals with individualities. The sane man dates and locates his experiences; and only for this reason does life have continuity and possibilities of growth. It must be clear, then, that the most important study in any college curriculum is precisely that which will formulate in his mind this power to grasp and group the facts of life into a system. That study

is philosophy. When we set the idea of philosophy over against the realism of our generation the former suffers by the comparison. Its speculation, its generalities, its inquiry into things beyond and outside of the concrete world of daily experience lend an unreality to it which makes it a *persona non grata* among the factors of practical life. Men condemn it as a dream, theoretical, irrelevant to their ends and aims, and prefer the firmer structures where real men and women toil to the flimsy castles of imagination. But their rejection of philosophy is no arraignment of its actual presence and power in human life, and the bluntest business man is dominated by its principles whether he will or not, for philosophy is merely an attempt to systematize our notions of the universe, and in striving to adapt more and more fully his business to the needs of the community where he operates he is laboring under the influence of the same great law that guides all action. To the school boy arithmetic is a series of isolated facts; the manifold permutations and combinations of numbers are like traps set for his intellectual downfall; he passes to algebra where the abstractions are still more vague; he finds in geometry only elusive figures and barren reasoning which merge him only further into a world of unreality. But the college student gathers all these individual facts into mathematics, and finds a rational pleasure in the vision of these correlations which reach to the very limit of space. The school boy studies physics, confronted by a most intimidating array of laws, formulæ and applications which perplex his idea of knowledge and seem an effectual bar to further mental progress. But the college student synthesizes all these phenomena of nature and discovers them to be a harmonious organism whose very essence is law and order. The school boy essays languages; one by one the slippery facts evade his unsteady grasp; words, phrases, clauses lie before him so unrelated that often tears blur the few clear glimpses of meaning which reward his honest search. But the college student correlates. Back of all these strangely different languages lies one mind. As he translates he realizes that the heart of humanity throbs

the same in all ages. Love, pride and ambition have swayed men since the beginning, and all these languages are but concrete forms in which the great human race voices and perpetuates itself in self-expression. But if the student correlates the facts within any one branch into a unity the branches themselves need a larger and final correlation. Have chemistry and biology, and literature and language a common bond? Only philosophy can answer; for only in philosophy can these great departments be gathered together. No other study is all-inclusive. It is here that science, religion, literature, life itself find a coherent and logical unity; it is here that the student's mind is cast in the mould which comprehends the universe as a whole. And he realizes for the first time the significance of Kant's definition of an organism that "It is a whole each part of which is at the same time the means and end of all the others." If philosophy bestows such a power, is it definitely related to practical life? Is the safer citizen he who studies important issues comprehensively, viewing the end from the beginning, or he who lacking the power of correlation, forms judgment from a few facts which may have impressed him more deeply than others?

The college idea rests on morality. The view is held that students attain their best growth in the enjoyment of undisturbed moral liberty. It is even averred that the college has nothing to do with the ethical side of a student's development. Such views are as illogical as they are perilous. From its first moment of conscious life the child is surrounded with the most careful moral influences; in its period of adolescence the moral guard is doubled, for both home and church are enlisted to protect the growing personality from processes of vitiation; all through their years of maturity and actual service men and women feel the need of moral support, and as life deepens they cling more closely—often desperately—to the bulwarks that shield them from sin and evil-doing. Why then should we assume that during the four years of college young men need no direct moral influence and gain their best ends when left to their own ethical devices? The assumption is

absurd. Does it mean nothing that scores of parents are asking earnestly whether it is safe to send their sons to college? Most serious indeed is the apprehension entertained by thoughtful men and women that our institutions of learning may lead their sons to moral ruin. The theoretical principle of evil in college communities takes less hold on the public mind. But when a once pure-minded boy leaves college debauched by sin, scarred by the evidences of his dissipation; when the son of practical parents returns with a diploma, to be sure, but stultified by fopperies of dress, manner and habit, flippant in his attitude toward coming life—and that in lieu of the power of manhood which his training ought to have given him, which, too, his parents had a right to expect—when results like this accrue from a college course, the very conditions stand out as an indictment against the institution which gave them being, and no words of defence can annihilate the fact that they are real.

All conduct is moral. No act can be divorced from consequences because each act involves reaction. And, too, no act can be performed without an engendered attitude, wherein precisely lies the ethical character of the act. Every moment of student activity is attended by moral issues and to give him over to the free exercises of his will is to abandon him, in a moment of critical experience, to choices and consequences which he is often too immature properly to face.

The conditions regnant in a college community are different from those of the larger world. In the latter, relationships are strangely fused and the web of social fabric so intricately woven that often clear moral vision seems impossible and pure judgments are rare. Men from their earliest years are largely creatures of environment. Born amid surroundings in which morality (and often immorality) is already systematized they breathe the atmosphere of what lies about them; they see, hear, imitate, absorb; they do not condemn the wrong, having become accustomed to it; they adopt the standard of their fellow-men because of the universality of its practice. Experience teaches them what they may or may not do with im-

punity; hence their morality is *a posteriori*, an average of what other men do, gathered after the deed is done, and utilitarian in the extreme.

Not so the college community. Here life is simpler and less complex. Relationships are fewer and less interwoven, hence more easily controlled. The attitude of the student to the college, to his teachers, to his fellows is less capable of moral misunderstanding; the temptations peculiar to self-interest are more scarce; the appeal to right living is infinitely stronger. He is enlightened by the great examples of history where men rise and fall in ratio to their ethics; he is reinforced by the influence of strong men who teach him and the noble characters who uphold the *rationale* of every college community. His original purpose is to seek power through knowledge; the necessity of making money is less keen—at least to such an extent that the growing moral sense is not strained by constant appeals to selfish interest. He thus possesses the supreme advantage of living four years outside of the larger world, of studying its phases without personal contact, of building up his morality before he enters the arena of actual service. In that sense the college man's ethics is *a priori*, formed from an environment morally clearer than the world's, chosen from a vantage ground which clarifies the vision and plants a strong hope in the breast beyond the power of after years to choke.

The admonitive power of such influences cannot be overestimated. It is true that the privilege of moral choice lies ultimately with the individual. But the moral influence of every college ought to be strong indeed, in order that the student may be stimulated and enabled to make the wisest possible choice. Since when must we apologize for guarding jealously the lives of our young men and pressing on them the necessity of cultivating purity and integrity? In this connection the personal example of the faculty is of vital import. Compulsory attendance at chapel would mean vastly more to the student if all members of the faculty were also required

to come. Their presence would go far toward impressing on the student body the significance of such occasions. Professors may not be obliged to teach morality, but they ought to *live* it and the character of each of them stands in direct relation to the ideals which the student forms for life. The latter finds many problems of vital moment pressing upon him for solution. Indifference or neglect on his part will not solve them. He must pass on them. And just here lies the incalculable value of a moral environment which is active rather than passive. These issues must be brought home to him; he must see them as they are. If he practises them he ought to endorse them; if he condemns them they must be avoided. He has the right to choose either side of an issue, but he must be urged to make the conscious choice. And once in possession of a rational decision he will go forth into the world a clear thinker and a conscientious actor.

The college idea gives point of view. Why do men seek the mountains during the summer? Why do they return with ruddy cheeks, rejuvenated, with that increment of health and vigor which carries them through the hardships of the ensuing winter? Has the mountain something which the valleys do not yield? There is no more inspiring moment in life than when one occupies some vantage ground which overlooks the world, far enough removed to escape its hum and whirl, yet near enough to see, and seeing to observe. He who climbs a mountain labors up its acclivity without a view, but when he is once above, the mountain no longer conceals but reveals. Our colleges must stand for more than the routine of recitation work. The conditions which contribute to the making of manhood and character reach far below the mechanical processes by which each day's schedule is carried out. If education is measured by the amount of actual knowledge which the student carries from his courses the system would be a failure and the college diploma a misrepresentation. The completion of certain courses and the accumulation of a definite number of credits may suffice to determine a student's official standing on

the books of the college, but they do not insure him the possession of that development which alone makes for power. And many who in the glamour of commencement week believe themselves to be truly educated will awaken one day in the larger world only to find themselves still crude and unprepared for the life that throbs in such tremendous pulsations around them. Is it then accidental that most colleges are set on hills? One cannot possibly overestimate the value of four years spent on life's summits while the drama of the real world is enacted below and around. To be thus a passive spectator, to observe and reflect, to study and appropriate—are privileges peculiar to the lofty view point and are fundamental to the idea of an adequate education.

The graduate speaks of college as the best part of his life; the poet sings of "The golden haze of college days," and memory weaves a veritable halo around the beloved alma mater. The larger world can nowhere duplicate the exact conditions which surround a young man during his college course. There men serve others; in college themselves. There they aim at deeds; in college at ideas. The former imposes compulsory labor, the latter voluntary service. The bond of college life unites hundreds of young men without the vestige of a pledge or even a voluntary act. The class-relationship joins only closer those who labor side by side; and the fraternity offers a cozy fireside for congenial spirits. The buildings themselves make a strong appeal to the sympathy and sentiment of the student; the trees bear faithful witness of hundreds whose feet have trod the campus in former days, and over all hangs that real, tangible presence of college spirit in which professor, student, buildings, nay even the humblest janitor, partake, merge their identity and form an organism which loyal hearts idealize into a veritable shrine. If, then, the student surveys life from the college hill and through the atmosphere which can be found alone on such lofty ground, he brings to his career and service a point of view which qualifies him to lead his fellow-men.



The college idea brings a vision. The world has little patience with a dreamer, but that is largely because it does not understand the nature of a dream. Are not buildings, plants, in fact whole cities first conceived in the minds of men who have faith in the future, then sketched in the plans of an architect and finally reared in concrete form? It was the vision which foreran the creation, but the world sees only the creation. Men who deal with things in the larger world believe that education involves no more than the acquisition of facts and therefore ask: "Why study Latin? Few can read it; most men forget it and its facts have no relation to practical life." We answer: "It gives a vision, no more, no less. But in the length and breadth of that vision lies much of life." They who expect students to issue from our colleges equipped with the greatest possible number of facts will invariably be disappointed, and they who limit education to the mere issues of practical living have no right to discuss the educational problem at all. Education does not deal with mere living or with so-called practical living. That is accomplished by myriads of men who have never entered a high school, much less a college or university. We readily grant that men can pass from the cradle to the grave without an education and find a definite place in the world's work. But they cannot live deeply. Education deals with the extensive and intensive phases of life; enriches the mind not with facts but with the relationship of facts. He who considers how little learning he can acquire to meet the necessities of his career wastes that little when it becomes his, for it is not worth the getting. How can he who has never had a vision determine the value of what other men see? What worth can his ideas have when he declares himself on matters which lie so wholly outside his own experience? The educational vision is of the past and future. Art and sculpture, æsthetic form and literature, the antique, the classical, the oriental, the mediæval, the sources of culture and the splendid achievements of history—all these are life as it was, and the student thrilled by this vision of

the past frames from it his vision of the future. There are infinite possibilities in its height and depth and breadth because it contains the inspiration of infinite labor. Such men do not dream; they see. And they offer willingly, eagerly their utmost devotion to the vision. Hence their view is large, their judgment ample, their effort wise because they are guided by the unerring clearness of a broad and lofty vision. By such men the world's work is being done to-day.

The college idea brings enthusiasm. It is true that the world possesses deep sentiments. Love has always been the master passion of the heart, and patriotism has kindled many a life to deeds of unexampled valor. Time was when masses of people were swept into great movements by an *esprit du corps* which one does not encounter in these days when individuals view issues in a colder because more selfish light. The splendid achievement of Peter the Hermit and the equally splendid response of the mediæval heart to the magic of his exhortation must thrill every heart that throbs even intermittently with the blood of romantic zeal. But in our age men are arrayed against each other and the game of life is rather to check others than to lead them into kindred enterprises. Enthusiasm in the larger world is therefore somewhat disorganized, or at least a more personal matter. The struggle for existence is less romantic than it ought to be. Men work because their labor stands between them and starvation. The tense-drawn face, the dogged faithfulness, the armed neutrality and cheerless truce of modern social classes betray the presence of no friendly attitude within, while the few who succeed find fewer still to cheer them in their moment of success. One of the greatest needs of our day is goodwill among the classes of society and an enthusiasm which makes for the success of the individual without embittering his fellow-men. Nowhere is such enthusiasm being generated save in our colleges. The athletic conditions and policies of American institutions have been discussed, criticized, condemned and defended too often and too keenly to warrant at this point

a reference to their merits or demerits. The mass of students is reached athletically by prescribed gymnastic work. The varsity teams are accessible only to the few whose abilities entitle them to represent their alma mater in intercollegiate contests. The charge that they offer to the students at large only meager opportunities for athletic development is true. It is also true that the students who play on varsity teams do so at a personal sacrifice of time and labor, often in jeopardy of their scholastic standing, with glory as their chief reward. But it is equally true that all students participate in these great athletic events in a manner which helps them more than if they actually played. When five hundred, or a thousand, or two thousand young men are centered heart, soul and body on the success of their team, giving expression to their loyalty in concerted cheers and pulsing songs that echo and re-echo over the field of action, it is a psychological moment when every nerve fiber thrills with equal impulse; when every vocal chord vibrates in kindred harmony; where every individual difference is buried; where widely differentiated lives have a common thought and end. The impress of such a moment is indelible; the effect of such enthusiasm ineradicable. The student life is stirred to its lowest depths and the optimistic impulse engendered thus will vibrate as long and as often as great causes enlist human effort. This is the lasting benefit of college athletics, a benefit which reaches every student's heart and is in itself sufficient to justify the *raison d'être* of college sport. The world cannot furnish a similar spectacle; the world does not even understand its expression on the athletic field. But students who have been thus thrilled, when they take their place beside companions in the world's work will labor with the old enthusiasm and win with the old success, while their neighbor falters and complains because he cannot share an optimism which was never kindled in his earlier life and which in his more meager judgment life's station does not demand or warrant.

The college idea involves culture. Probably no word is so

variously used and understood as culture. It stands for almost every phase of cultivation ranging from capricious fads to the deepest appreciation of the soul. Most normally it expresses a fondness for high things and a resultant refinement of the general personality. Thus culture is by no means the sole prerogative of the rich or highly educated classes. And if it is not widely diffused the reason does not lie in its incapability to be democratic, but rather because the public mind—high, low, rich and poor alike—is dull to grasp its worth and recognize it as a vital factor in social as well as economic growth. These are days of social reform, but there would be less need of reform if proper forces were at work moulding American character. The American mind is complacently self-centered, not keen to the abuses of good taste and form. Consequently more or less coarseness has crept into our public life and is reflected in the daily practice. These exhibitions of unrefinement we may not endorse, but they lie about us and their presence is a sufficient condemnation of our *laissez faire* methods. Just here lies the transcendent danger of so much that inheres in American life. Its subtlety blinds us to its peril. Men will not believe that certain tendencies are dangerous, because they are only tendencies and have not as yet led to positive disaster. They read day after day what ought never to have been printed; they see constantly in picture and cartoon exaggerations that could never be legitimate objects of artistic treatment; they hear what with all justice to its simplicity of harmony can never elevate. It is argued, to be sure, that they read and see and hear indifferently, with a momentary glance, to pass the time, as an offset to the strenuous demand of the daily task, and the idea of danger is scouted. Gradually, however, the public sense of refinement is blunted and men come to accept unconsciously what they would not consciously endorse. Moreover, these same tendencies lie close to growing children, whose ideals are greatly affected by their daily environment. Our country is inundated by a flow of so-called popular music, written by men whose

claim to recognition is completely nullified by the sort of trash they compose, written to words so absolutely void of poetic worth that they would be ridiculous if their influence were not so pernicious, adorned with a title page whose lack of art can be explained only on the ground that the whole idea was conceived and executed with the sole motive of making money by "making a hit." Hundreds of thousands of copies reach our homes, their melodies are re-echoed on the streets, are heard at popular concerts. And when their baneful influence is hinted at, such misgivings are met with the assertion that people listen only superficially. No truer indictment of the whole matter could be made than this assertion. People do listen superficially; they delight in a catchy air—until another more catchy supersedes it, which in turn is spurned for newer attractions. Meanwhile they lose the faculty of permanent preference and—what is far more serious—the power to appreciate good music. Its deeper import, stricter form, more insistent appeal to an intellectual and emotional responsiveness, its more complicated melody, are no match for the easier, subtler charm of the popular style, and youthful hearts throb in unison with a rhythm that slowly dulls their inner musical sense and finally legalizes a canon of taste which is a perpetual shame to those who love the æsthetic reputation of their land.

We suffer as a nation from a lack of atmosphere. We have artists but little art; we have sculptors but little sculpture; we have musicians but little music. In literature, men write dramas, but there is no dramatic technique; novels appear in abundance but they are not classified into schools of thought nor do they follow certain lines of development. Our dramas contain the problems of politics, sociology, sex, love and psychology, but they are not sociological as such, because their forms and ideas are fused together arbitrarily and without system. Our novels deal with most varying phases of human feeling and action; yet they have no conscious historical continuity with preceding novels either in technique or content. They are seldom written to exemplify an idea or a definite

system of thought; their authors aim mostly at literary fame or financial profit. Behind our books and dramas there should be an atmosphere of literature; under our music productions should lie the substratum of musical beauty; back of our painting and sculpture should stand the ideal of art. And pervading all these manifestations must be a general atmosphere out of which they will emanate not as individuals isolated and unrelated but kindred in nature and purpose because born of the same substance.

Shall we then not continue to hear the drone of popular music? Yes. Will the ignoble exhibition of profaned art disappear from periodical literature? No. But the solution of the problem contained in our discussion will be found in the deepening, broadening and heightening of American culture. Such a transformation will never be wrought by societies formed for the dissemination of culture or the annihilation of bad taste. This is preëminently the age of organization and society is already overorganized. The pulpit and press are doing little to develop culture. Our magazines print what people want to read and their idea of literary availability is largely what will increase the sale of their periodicals. The renaissance must come with the college man. Everything that the college idea stands for will enable him to deal effectively with the problem of social culture. His trained power, his touch with the past, his vision of truth, his quickened moral sense, his swift perception of social movements—these are new and potent forces which he brings as his contribution to life's service, and society cannot be insensible to these healthful influences. In journalism his ideals will make for purer reading and better literary expression; in public life he will maintain insistence on clean methods and honest conduct; in social intercourse his love of lofty things will draw men from what is gross and unrefined. And thus will be hastened the dawn of a day when the varying phases of life shall have a common background, pervaded by a general atmosphere in which we shall inhale the breath of a true refinement and realize the possibilities of a practical culture.

The college idea ought to bring an awakening. Hundreds of students are going in and out before us every year untouched by the influences which the college represents. They pass out into life, and often through the entire length of their career in a state where apparently only the lower functions of being are brought into play. But it is not such men who do the world's work. The feeble vision, the numb sense, the sluggish will, the dim perception may suffice to minister to the immediate daily needs, but these unawakened men are as isolated from social growth as if they had never seen a human face. There comes to most men, however, a psychological moment when the inner soul and the outer environment must be adjusted. All the power of the one is pitted for the moment against that of the other. If the relationship is readily determined peace ensues and a harmonious operation. If not, the crisis is fraught with the most tragic possibilities. In this struggle the individual merges from the darkness of innocence into the light of virtue. He looks into his own soul; sees its depth, longings, ideals. It is a solemn moment and no one can stand thus face to face with the unbared reality of his own personality without a feeling of awe and reverence for the causes which gave it original being. Some suffer a cataclysm of brain or heart. Doubt rends them asunder; misfortune crushes them almost beyond the ability to rise again; or love flames in the heart with absorbing passion and consuming power; in any case the crisis comes and with it the agony, the testing. The awakened soul alone has power. It is the butterfly we value, not the chrysalis. And in education no less than in the storm and stress of life it is the awakening that marks the birth of power. A student may pass his examinations or prescribed courses of study, and to be sure with distinction; his natural ability may lead him to astonishing mental achievements; but he may graduate helpless before the issues of the larger life. The acquisition of facts derived from courses of study can no longer be regarded as the chief benefit of college training. If it were, the meager accumulation made by most



students would be a standing satire on education as a means of mental development. It is not the function of education to amass knowledge, nor is it fair to impose on the memory the impossible task of bearing all the facts which come within the range of human consciousness. The student needs the capacity to understand the relationship of facts. But this capacity comes only through regeneration. There is such a thing as not knowing one's self. A man can live a stranger to his own soul. But he cannot possess power. There is almost a mystery about the phenomenon of self-discovery. It takes place in the quiet hour within the shadow of the college, when reflection invites self-examination and self-examination reveals the soul within. It is the meeting of the heart and brain; the union of the inner and the outer life; the discovery of personality, its needs and its longings; the revelation of a world which though separated from the world of things is after all the same world, only in its higher manifestation, its rarified stratum, its purer, better part. It is, then, the awakening of this self as related to the external world which constitutes the essence of education. In after life men are awakened mostly through pain, or struggle, or loss. But infinitely fortunate is the student on whom the college idea operates forcibly enough to reveal the vast dignity and transcendent power of his own personality. For ninety-nine students who merely complete their courses a college would be fortunate to produce one thus awakened and quickened, for the ninety-nine can only reproduce what they have learned, but the one will do a giant's work.

The college ought to be the cradle of greatness. The human mind has lost nothing of its power. The race has not deteriorated, and ambition now as of old spurs most men on to action. But the motives which prompt it at present are different and its force is spent along different lines. The ancient world conquerors longed for military dominion; those of modern times strive for political and financial supremacy. There is too little greatness in American life outside of financial achievements. The latter are wrought with a stupendousness the

world has never witnessed, and as a result the commercial idea lends hue to almost every American ideal. But civilization is not preserved and developed by money alone and it is indeed one of the greatest necessities of our generation to realize that many of the prime factors of progress have no financial value at all. Art, music, literature lack the power of self-perpetuation. They do not exist apart from those who produce them and they rise no higher than the level of those who gave them being. Colossal buildings and costly temples which house these precious legacies are no guarantee that art and music will live. Money cannot purchase the immortality of a single beautiful ideal. Art is life, and when life runs low art languishes. Our supreme national need is great men, great because they create, great because they have a vision, great because they are filled with a lofty purpose to crystallize their ideal in verse, in stone or oil. Greatness is creation. To do what other men have done is imitation, not greatness. Whence then shall come the inspiration to be great? We look in vain for it in the world at large. There the spirit is selfish. Men take rather than give, whereas greatness gives rather than seeks. It is not merely an effort of the will. It springs from congenial soil, from sympathetic environment, from kindred conditions, from responsive chords. There must be an atmosphere which stimulates the creative impulse; a substratum which supports its fabric; a *milieu* which favors its exercise. And with it all, the strong call to achievement from the awakened heart, the thrill of genius, the titanic force, the struggle with life's problems, out of which grow peace and genial productiveness. If, then, the spirit of the times does not foster greatness it must spring from the college environment. The universities of Europe have been the cradle of liberty, often amid most intolerant conditions. Why should we not expect our institutions to foster the growth of literary greatness and to produce types of men who can perpetuate the glories of the past in an equally glorious future? Our great literary authors are passing; with them passes also their art. The liter-

any standard of our present writing is relatively low, because emphasis is laid on content rather than on form. The reading public seeks ideas and concerns itself less with the medium through which they are expressed. Since therefore general conditions do not encourage or stimulate high achievements in art and literature the springs of creativeness run slow. This languor must be quickened and the individual awakened to a new zeal. Literary development must keep pace with commercial expansion, and the college man, whose environment is a constant inspiration and appeal to deeds of creativeness, is preëminently fit to carry on the work which great men have laid down, and his pen will write the literary message of the future.

The college idea develops the spirit of reverence. The undergraduate pledges unwavering troth to the college of his choice; no alumnus ever gave or suffered insult to the colors he once wore. Proud of his alma mater, jealous of her name, zealous for her fame, he cherishes her memory with a reverence the larger world does not feel. Each hall, tower and building, the campus with its bending trees, are imaged in his heart. And as the alma mater song rises proudly on the air he stands with uncovered head until the last echoes have died away. Is this homage offered to the unknown god? Such reverence is the crying need of American civilization. When men cast away tradition and relegated its treasures to the obsolete the iconoclasm was sweeping in the extreme. Religious beliefs, political practices, educational ideals long cherished were condemned as fetish. The canons of a thousand years were burned at the stake. And now after the smoke has cleared away we are discovering that these iconoclasts have very little to put in the place of the time-honored system and that there has ensued a vital loss of reverence in the hearts of men and women which bodes small good for the future. And too, the phenomenal growth of wealth has brought with it increase of good living and enjoyment of social comforts. Our youth, reared in an atmosphere of freedom and ease, develops

an aversion to discipline and a lack of that earnestness which comes with endurance and more frugal habits. There is nothing more flippant than the spectacle of young people, who looking with contempt on a past of which they themselves are vastly unworthy, seek to move and act within the privileges of their newborn ideas with an ignorance and pseudo-gravity that would be amusing if they were not an ominous sign of the times. Ridicule is confessedly cheap—and worthless. But its relations when they have become habitual can prove a formidable menace to progress. Irreverence is the vice of our younger generation. Disrespect of parents, impatience toward old age, decadent inclination in matters of moral import, overweening vanity—and these in youthful characters that are uncultured and imperious! Our youth of to-day stand as no great monument to the forces that moulded them. And wide indeed are the consequences of this disrespect. The treasures of art and literature are lightly esteemed because their compelling worth finds no response of reverence in the individual heart. Great ideas and institutions are invested with a sacredness which no one can deny with impunity. They overawe and command. The safety of state and the fate of society hang on the esteem which they are able to win from the popular heart. When we desecrate the altars of the past; when we cease to revere the ideals which our forefathers loved; when we lose power to value that which life holds of highness and nobility, then we are exposing ourselves to dangers which neither armies, nor governments nor coercion can avert, for the process of decay is internal, and general social disintegration is only a matter of time. It must be clear, then, that the spirit of reverence which the college man brings with him into the larger world must be of incalculable value in preserving social conditions which shall be hopeful and helpful in the maintenance of our national prosperity.

Education, then, deals with mental power; develops it through an awakening; unifies it through philosophy; clarifies it by a vision of truth; fortifies it by morality and the living

appeal of life's highest good. Thus equipped the college man goes into the world a cultivated personality. We have used the terms philosophy, morality, vision, point of view, atmosphere, enthusiasm, greatness, culture, awakening. It will be objected that they are only general qualities of personality, whereas education aims at specific training; that they are therefore not legitimate objects of educational discussion. If, then, objectors will maintain, training for specific ends constitutes an education, it can be acquired without considering these cultural "luxuries" which adorn, to be sure, even if they are not indispensable. And if knowledge be the end of learning, as others assert, it is obviously a loss of time to busy ourselves with anything but its acquisition. But these are precisely the hypotheses which we deny. If specific training be the end in view then education reaches only a small part of a man's career and gives him no power, no equipment, no preparation for the larger part of life which he as a member of society must live during the intervals between his vocational duties. A man is safest when he is busy; is most dangerous during the freedom of his avocation hours. If, therefore, education has nothing to do with the conduct and control of this avocational freedom, then our institutions of learning do not deserve to exist, for they neglect the most vital part of the human problem and abandon their trained graduates to a helpless attitude before life's realities which may easily prove their undoing. And if knowledge be the test of the educational idea, then education is a failure. On the basis of knowledge how many students deserve a diploma? If a student's amount of information were determined in relation to what he ought to know, how many could graduate? And yet hundreds do graduate every year. But even if a student did acquire sufficient knowledge to entitle him to a diploma, what good would the mass of facts do him or any one else? Is he to hold these facts so that others may come to take or borrow them? But that is the function of the library. Is he to pass them on to his neighbor? But our books and journals are performing that service. No, no. The function of education is to teach

life, life in its widest range, life in its deepest meaning. If men are to live properly, we must teach them how. If they are to think earnestly we must awaken them to deep realizations of truth; if they are to deal comprehensively with life's problems they must have a unity of consciousness which will grasp details and view them as parts of a system. If they are to represent us creditably on public occasions they must *possess sufficient culture to make them capable of polished self-expression*. If art and literature are to be perpetuated they must be understood and fostered by those whose reverence enables them to feel their ennobling value. The rich man can purchase paintings and statuary. But no money can buy art. It does not exist save in the ideals of those whose awakened souls behold the vision. And if we are to have honest men with honest methods and honest results they must enter the struggle strong in the conviction that national purity depends upon personal purity and that the nation's honor sits on the *brow of the individual citizen*. *A college president recently brought home to the trustees the necessity of broadening their institution. If by broadening he meant a larger array of facts for the students to learn his recommendation was worthless.*

We are teaching already more facts than our students can or will learn. We do not need breadth of that sort. We must teach our students the meaning of facts, to correlate them, to interpret them, to determine their relationships and then *apply the results of these discoveries to the relationships of the daily life*. Men need the power to live, not merely the ability to do one thing well. The ignorant man deals with isolated facts and must necessarily always be learning the same things in the same way. To him repetition means progress. The wise man generalizes on the facts of experience, learns their laws and acquires power. Breadth, then, must be in no case an increase in the number of studies without an accompanying depth of comprehension. It is intensive, not extensive. The springs of power lie far deeper than most men suppose.

And just here lies the fallacy of the practical man's view.

He wants efficient employees but he does not understand how such employees are made efficient. He mislocates the sources of power because he has not known how power is generated. He persists in believing that ability comes from repetition and thus relegates development to the level of habit. He insists that he who performs a task a thousand times thereby acquires power, ignorant that power is begotten by devotion to ideals. *The secret of real power lies beyond his comprehension.*

*The strength of the college lies in the relation of the college idea to the student idea. One must dominate the other. At present the former is weaker than the latter. Students come to college, most of them willing to learn, but their natural inclination is towards pleasure and recreation. Athletics, society, music, reading, and often debauchery are the modes in which the student idea expresses itself. The recitation, lecture, laboratory, and examination are the modes in which the college idea expresses itself. The student enters college primarily to get an education and will follow the one or the other of these ideas. Every institution to-day comprises three classes of men—a few who seek and work earnestly, many who have no definite attitude, and some who do not intend to work at all. The first class is a delight; the third class ought to be ejected; the second class can be reached and redeemed. Why are they not reached? Because the student idea is stronger than the college idea. College life includes work and pleasure. Must one of these be gained at the cost of the other? By no means. The student's problem is neither how to work nor how to play but how to do both. And wise indeed is he who determines for his own life the proper relation of work and recreation.*

But the appeal of the college idea is too weak. It is a common saying that "If a man can once enter college he can go through and graduate." And it is undeniably true that many receive diplomas who are utterly unworthy of them. Furthermore, students neglect their work, seek pleasure, determine arbitrarily the conduct of their college career. But the greater



fault lies with the institution which domiciles them. The college idea can express itself in two ways. It cannot force men to study but it can drop them if they refuse to study. And such a course is often salutary for those who remain. But that is not educating. Is it better to drop a student for being purposeless and indolent, or to awaken in him a spirit of manhood and industry? The manifestation of the college idea as a coercive force will never accomplish the ends of education, because the application of such force cannot touch or reach the real issue. Young men are naturally active and must keep themselves occupied. If the college program is formal and uninteresting, they will honestly turn to the more congenial forms of recreation and enjoyment. It is the college which should dominate these forms also. It should furnish music as a means of enjoyment and culture; it should teach students how to use and value a library; it should make them readers and intelligent critics of their own literature; it should provide social entertainments where the student would acquire a general *savoir faire* by contact with cultured men and women; it should teach students to control themselves by employing a system of self-government where they would learn the responsibilities of executive service. The faculty should be men of strong character, who not merely are able to teach their courses, but represent in their personality a magnetic type of culture and perfected manhood. The eminent professor bending under the burden of degrees and titles is not necessarily a man of power. Our institutions lose hold on the respect and confidence of students by appointing too many young men whose Ph.D. is supposed to be a guarantee that they possess the latest methods and results of scholarship, whereas their weaker appeal to the esteem of undergraduates neutralizes the influence of their teaching. Our students cannot take the initiative in matters of education. Nor ought they. We have had instances where young men have risen in rebellion against obsolete and ineffective methods; many earnest students are at present condemning their colleges for precisely the same inadequacy. But such incidents are abnormal. Where could

one find a more pathetic or humiliating arraignment of our educational system? Especially when such dissatisfaction exists also among thoughtful alumni! And where there are weaknesses in the standard and practice of educational ideas, it is unfortunately the student who is the loser; it is his future which suffers, his power which remains undeveloped.

The right to express an opinion is characteristically American. We believe in free discussion and open criticism. Some of the changes which have taken place in our educational system are due to the pressure of public opinion, others to the requirements of new conditions. But the educational idea ought to dominate, not follow, public opinion. When students, parents, newspapers, the general public, and educators pass judgment on the question of the proper sphere and conduct of college work, the judgment of educators ceases to be authoritative. There is entirely too much meddling on the part of persons who are honest in their convictions but too ignorant of the situation to contribute anything but confusion to the desired solution. If education conforms to an ideal who is to proclaim that ideal? When a young man is to be educated who can better determine the scope and content of that education, the college or the young man's friends and relatives?

The college idea must be more assertive, more positive. Commercialism has gone to the fore and dominates American life to-day not because it is better than the college idea, but more active, more powerful, guided by a surer hand. A college president in a recent address indirectly admitted that he was not sure where the educational emphasis ought to be laid, and after stating two extremes of view placed it somewhere between them. Over against such vacillations of opinion set the clear utterances, the positive practices, the real achievements of commercial men and it will not be difficult to see why the latter control while the former lack force and influence.

The college idea has its own inherent ideals, strength and message; with them it must dominate the public mind, as it must also dominate the student's college course. His study,

his ambition, his social life, his whole career are impressionable to proper influences and he will give himself over without resistance to the administration of stronger minds if they can guide his college destinies more wisely and more agreeably than he himself. The college needs fellowship, the contact of heart with heart, the sharing of a common life, the social equality of student and professor. When our young men realize that their teachers are human and have a sincere interest in their welfare; when the teachers by their presence and attitude encourage and enjoy events which are deservedly dear to the student heart, then a serious obstacle to the development of educational power will have been removed; and in mutual confidence, mutual sympathy, and mutual esteem, the stronger, deeper, more cultured mind will lead, unconsciously but no less surely, the younger, plastic, receptive mind. And amid such congeniality of spirit the greatest possibilities of mental development can be realized.

We find, then, that the college idea ought to make a more definite and authoritative appeal to the public mind; that the function of education is to teach the student how to live in the fullest sense; that the knowledge gained in college courses is useless unless it is transformed into living power; that the student gains power not by the completion of prescribed courses, but through an awakening which shall reach the depths of his being; that this awakening shall be guided and unified by the systematizing influence of philosophy; that the college should offer him an environment in which the physical, intellectual, moral and social needs of his nature will find full exercise and satisfaction. We expect our students to enter college as boys but to emerge as men, and to work in the world with a zeal and power which shall stamp the college man as the best product of American civilization.

ORONO, ME.

## II.

### WHAT IS CHRISTIAN SALVATION?

CHARLES E. OREITZ.

I APPROACH my subject not as a theologian but as a pastor. One of the dangers of the scholar is that he becomes absorbed in thoughts and ideas, rather than in men; in words and formulas, rather than in things, in logic rather than in life, in a world of his own creation, rather than in the world which God made.

It is the preacher who deals at first hand with the great problems of theology, for he comes at grips with real life. He is in the midst of the arena. He stands where the battles of life are being fought. He is constantly placed where he must know how to bring the resources, not of theology, but of God, to the aid of the sinner struggling for deliverance, or perchance where he must first rouse the sinner to a sense of his need for deliverance. He is right down with the man in need of salvation. His world is a real world, and it is infinitely richer and vaster than the world of mere thoughts and ideas, and contact with it reveals much of the impotence and poverty of science and philosophy and theology.

I would not for a moment minimize the importance of the thought-world, or the power of ideas. But life comes before reflection on life; things before science; religion before theology; Christianity before doctrine. And these realities on which men exercise their thinking are fundamental and remain constant, while their theories and explanations of them are ever changing.

My desire, therefore, is not so much to present a theory of salvation as to make a simple statement of those elemental and unchangeable factors which enter into a true conception of

salvation, and which have always been present in the message of the Church from the beginning of time.

This declaration of purpose will at once eliminate from our discussion any exhaustive treatment of the many theories which have grown up in the course of the ages around the simple yet profound idea of salvation. I shall of course have to refer constantly to these theories and doctrines, but it will be only for the purpose of making the facts upon which they are based, stand forth in clearer relief.

The burden of the Gospel message in all ages has always been *salvation*, and the preacher's primary task has been to deliver that message and to make it effective in the lives of the people. The message in itself is simple enough—so simple, indeed, that a child can understand it. That fact should have saved the Church from building around it such a rampart of metaphysical, philosophical and theological masonry that even the wisest of men find great difficulty in getting at it.

It is unfortunate that the Church has never been able to agree on what are the really essential factors in salvation. There have always been those who say: "We are the Church and there is none other, and if you want to be saved you must come in with us." They say: "We believe in the Holy Trinity, or in the twofold nature of the person of Christ, or in apostolic succession, or in the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, or in the inerrancy of the Bible, or in the regenerating grace of the sacraments, or in experiential conversion, or in foreordination, or in the eternal damnation of the lost, or in a substitutionary atonement, and unless you believe as we do, you are lost."

But behold a miracle! The impossible has actually happened. Men have gone straight ahead and been saved anyhow, in spite of denominational prohibition. The Quaker has been saved without the sacraments; the Unitarian without faith in the trinity and therefore in the Deity of Jesus Christ; the Methodist without apostolic succession and the laying on of hands; the Episcopalian without immersion; and Socrates and Abraham Lincoln, most people, I imagine would believe

were saved outside of the Church altogether, unless we hold the invisible Church in reserve for all those whom our common sense can not shut out entirely from the Kingdom of God, even though they had no connection whatsoever with the institution of the visible Church.

The history of redemption itself seems to be the best possible evidence that salvation is largely independent of theory or at least that the doctrines of the Church occupy only a subordinate place in this great fact.

What then is Christian salvation? The form of this question would seem to imply that there are different kinds of salvation—that there is a Christian salvation as distinguished from salvation that is not Christian. But this can be the case only, it seems to me, if we regard Christian salvation as salvation through the historic Christ, or salvation brought about by Christian agencies and instrumentalities.

I go on the assumption, however, that salvation in its essence is the same, no matter by what means it may be brought about, so that pre-Christian salvation or salvation among the heathen who have never heard of Christ is the same in nature and substance as the salvation which comes through more specifically Christian agencies.

What now are the essential elements in the fact of salvation? In the nature of the case these must be few and easily understood. They dare not create intellectual difficulties, so that only the learned can grasp them. They must also be things that are common to all Churches. On the face of it the things on which churches disagree can not be an indispensable part of the message of salvation. There must, therefore, be a certain irreducible minimum of fact which belongs to all churches, and which constitutes the heart of the message—indeed is the Christian message of salvation. There must be something that is common to all and that remains constant through all time and all changes, which has made possible what we see and know, viz.: the salvation of men under the most diverse and even contradictory dogmatic and credal teaching and belief.

I do not say that these differences are trivial or unimportant. But the message of salvation can not be in these differences but rather in that which is common to all. Paul and Augustine and Anselm and Luther and Zwingli and Calvin and Wesley and Edwards and Brooks did not preach the same theology, but each of them must have preached the essential Gospel, of which their converts are sufficient proof. The Baptist, the Presbyterian, the Episcopalian and the Methodist have different confessional standards and yet multitudes are being saved by each of these communions. What better proof than this that the things on which they differ are not an essential part of their message. There must be something which they all hold in common, which constitutes the real message which they severally proclaim.

To discover or rather to state this greatest common divisor, these essential elements, these fundamental facts which have constituted the message of salvation of the Church in all ages, and which must enter into any true conception of the fact of salvation itself—this is the task now before us.

I. The first of these factors is sin. Sin has created the problem of salvation. Without sin there would be no need of salvation, for whatever salvation may have come to mean on its positive side, it stands first for deliverance from the guilt and power of sin. Our whole doctrine of salvation presupposes a world of sin. This is one of the great realities about whose existence there is no dispute. The Heidelberg Catechism asks early: "How many things are necessary for thee to know that than . . . mayest live and die happily," and the answer is: "Three things," and the first of these is: "the greatness of my sin and misery." All systems of theology, all religions undertake to deal with this problem of sin, so that here we have one of the primal factors of the problem of salvation.

But as soon as we enter upon an explanation of this fact, as to its origin, its nature, its remedy, etc., we divide into different camps. How did sin come into the world? How is God related to the origin of sin? What is the origin of sin in ourselves? A correct answer to all these questions might be



very interesting, might indeed be helpful. But so far as we know Christ never even so much as touched on this problem. He accepted the fact of sin without any inquiry apparently into its ultimate cause. The great problem that confronted Him was how to rid the world of the sin which He found in it. He found every man a sinner. As to just how he became a sinner does not seem to concern him greatly, especially in so far as the cause of his sin might lie way back in the Garden of Eden. He knew that the remedy for sin must be applied in the sinner himself, and not in his ancestor. His grandfather might have sinned and brought misery and wretchedness on his descendant, but there is no opportunity now any more to change those consequences by applying the remedy to the grandfather. Salvation must be effected in his descendant.

It is true, of course, that many problems are helped in their solution by a knowledge of their cause or genesis, but so far as the problem of sin is concerned, Jesus seems to have made no attempt to trace it farther back in its origin than the sinner himself, and He never seemed to intimate that any one but the transgressor was responsible for his transgressions. This does not mean of course that the ultimate source of sin must lie in the individual sinner. It only means that it cannot be a matter of vital importance to salvation to possess a clear understanding of the origin of evil.

Then when we come to the nature and the ultimate effect or consequences of sin we are no more agreed than we are with reference to its origin. Is man totally depraved and if so what is total depravity? There are those who mean by it absolute moral and spiritual deadness, which is as incapable of voluntary action as a corpse. Others see in it only a sinful taint which has passed over the entire man, and leaves no part or faculty untouched or unvitiated.

And what is the penalty of sin? Is punishment everlasting? Is it vindictive or remedial? Is its purpose reformatory or penal? or is it perhaps the natural and inevitable consequence of broken law? Does it perhaps follow sinning as naturally

and inevitably as pain follows from placing the hand into the fire?

There is no uniformity of opinion or doctrine on the subject of sin, all of which goes to show that theories and explanations are not the essential things. As to the fact of sin all men are agreed, and every scheme of salvation deals with this problem. There never has been a message of salvation delivered anywhere by anyone that has not presupposed sin, so that our conclusion is that here we have one of those common elemental facts, which is present in every scheme and plan of salvation, and that the matter of prime importance is not so much whether we can make men *understand* the mystery of iniquity, as whether we can make them understand the iniquity of this mystery. The man who can do this has a power for good which is beyond all dispute and in the degree in which the preachers and teachers of the Church have been able to make men realize the iniquity of personal sin, have they made effective use of this first great and awful fact, which has been a factor in the message of salvation of the Church in all ages. Their explanations and theories have been subordinate. These may have differed with every division of the Church and in every succeeding age; but that has not mattered much. The thing of prime importance has been that men should be made to feel their sins in such a way that they would seek for deliverance.

II. The second factor in the problem of salvation is God, Who can save and is ever active in saving men from their sins. Without sin there would be no need of salvation; without God there could be no possibility of salvation, and this has been a part of the message of salvation in all ages. The whole of pre-Christian history reveals God active in the saving of his people. He comes into the ruined garden to save his sinning children. He comes in vision and in prophecy, in judgment and in mercy, in pain and in blessing that He may save His people. He pleads with them; He threatens them; He chastises them; but always apparently with the ultimate purpose of saving them.

*But at once the question arises: How does God save? How*

can He save? On what grounds can He forgive sin? How for instance did God save in pre-Christian ages, if He saved at all? How were Abraham and Moses and David saved? What is the relation of Christ to their salvation, if any? Could God forgive sin before Christ had in some way changed God's moral relation to the race? Could men be forgiven before the incarnation and the cross made the forgiveness of sin possible? As the beginnings of the race recede farther and farther into the past, it becomes increasingly difficult to believe that the salvation of men in the pre-Christian era was dependent on their faith in a Christ coming thousands of years later or in an event or a transaction at a vastly remote distance in the future. But this brings us at once face to face with the person and work of Jesus Christ. Who was He? Whence did He come? How is He related to God? What is the mystery of His person? What was His mission and how did He accomplish it? What is His relation to the salvation of men?

Here again we meet with a great variety of answers. The Church has never been agreed in its interpretation of either the person or the work of Christ. But surely our salvation can not wait until all these questions have been correctly answered. Indeed there seems little possibility that they will ever be answered in the same way. Therefore it must be self-evident that salvation does not depend on their absolutely correct answer. Men have been saved apparently under every variety of belief with reference to the person of Christ, or did salvation halt during the period of the great Christological controversies? Was there no saving going on until an orthodox christology had been wrought out by the Church? And what shall we say about the great variety of beliefs with reference to the person of Christ to-day? Shall we consign all the Unitarians to perdition? Shall we deny salvation to the new theologian and the higher critic, who may deviate in their *opinions from the orthodox standards?* Indeed the heretic of one age has sometimes become the orthodox of another, and for all that one can see, some heretics would seem to stand as good a chance of getting to heaven as some who are strictly orthodox.

Of course arrogance and pride and self-conceit are as hateful to God in the one, as they are in the other.

The same thing is true of the death of Christ. What was *its* significance? In some way we believe that Christ's death is involved in the scheme of redemption; but no one seems to know just how. Many have thought that they knew, and have demonstrated to a conclusion the place of his death in the salvation of men. But the difficulty here lies in the fact that there have been numerous schemes of this kind wrought out to a finality, which yet differ widely from each other. Does it not depend very largely on a man's early training and on his mental constitution and habits as to whether he will adhere to one system rather than another. Of children born of Reformed parents and brought up in a Reformed environment, it may be predicted with perfect safety that the majority of them will in adult life adhere to the Reformed Church, and think the thoughts of the Reformed Church after it. The same thing is true of the Catholic or of any other branch of the Christian Church. There does not seem to me to be much comfort in this for those who are sure that they have the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Fortunately our doctrines cannot affect the solid facts of religion. The cross, for instance, is secure no matter what theories we may hold with reference to it. That which the cross symbolizes is one of the solid facts of experience. "Everyone who would attain to salvation must attain it by way of the cross. He must take up Christ's cross of sacrifice and make it his own. He must be crucified with Christ as Paul was. The death of Christ is the culmination of a career of suffering in self-giving; it is the symbol of the profoundest pity and yearning love for men and the utter self commitment to God. The man who will be saved must die a similar death. He must die to self that he may live unto God. He must in the realistic language of the Fourth Gospel eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ if he would have life."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Christian Doctrine of Salvation*, Stevens, p. 373.

The cross in this sense of course does not confine itself to the mere act of crucifixion. Dying may only be an incident in cross-bearing. Indeed dying may be the act which terminates cross-bearing, and may have no connection at all with the bearing of the cross. It is conceivable that a person might bear a heavy cross all his life long, and finally find sweet release through death. Would Christ not have born the cross if he had not died *on* the cross? Did He not say Himself "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me?" Would Christ not have given His life for the world if it had failed to culminate on Calvary? Was not His *life* rather than His death given as a ransom for many? If we must believe that his crucifixion was indispensable to salvation, we are driven to a dilemma from which no one has ever been able to extricate himself successfully. We must call a halt on the mind and say, "thus far but no farther." But the mind has its own laws and can not always be brought into abject submission to authority. It persists in asking, if the crucifixion was indispensable (I say indispensable, not inevitable); then the crucifiers were indispensable, for it is impossible to conceive of such a necessity executing itself, and even if that were possible it would lose all its significance. Neither is the modern mind satisfied to hide itself in the old refuge provided by the irreconcilability of God's foreknowledge and man's freedom. This is a real difficulty—divine omnipotence combined with omniscience on the one hand and human free will on the other, seem indeed to the human understanding to be incompatible ideas. Yet we are compelled to hold both. But the ethical consciousness of man refuses more and more to believe that such a crime as the crucifixion of Christ was indispensable to man's salvation.

But not only does man's moral nature rebel against it, but his reason and common sense also. Does not the whole public ministry of Jesus witness to the fact that He sought in every legitimate way to win the nation to Himself? Was He not making every possible effort to get them to accept Him as the Messiah? What if they had done so? Did He know that then

His mission would be a failure? Or was He only feigning? Were His efforts a sham?

It may be objected that such questions are idle and fruitless—that the Scriptures and the councils have decided them for all time. But may we not say here what Farrar said of Paul, who is largely responsible for the attitude of the historical creeds on the significance of Christ's death, though he himself had wrought out no complete doctrine of this great problem. "If Paul," he says, "again and again flings from him with a 'God forbid!' the conclusions of an apparently irresistible logic" may we not too refuse to follow when our conclusions both from Scripture and logic lead us in the direction of ethical stultification or moral suicide? And do we not have other facts from history to support us in this contention? Was not slavery at one time defended both from Scripture and reason, as a divinely sanctioned, if not, indeed, a divinely appointed institution. But neither Scriptures nor logic could again force that institution upon the conscience of the modern world. Every variety of cult and practice has had itself supported by the Scriptures, but in the end the general attitude of the Bible, its inner spirit and motive have always triumphed over proof-texts.

And so the modern mind somehow or other believes that it might have been possible for the Jews to have accepted Jesus as the Messiah, and the world *yet to have been saved*.

But let me repeat, this to my mind in no way removes the real cross out of its true place in the fact of salvation. Yea rather it enlarges the scope of its activity and significance. God has always been bearing the cross, that is, suffering and giving His life for the salvation of His people, and at last in the fulness of time He came in the completest revelation which He can make of Himself in the person of His son not simply to make an exhibition before the world of the greatness of His love, and the hatefulness and iniquity of sin, but in redeeming activity.

Herein lies the finality of the Christian religion. Jesus Christ we believe to be the final revelation of God, and also

the final and complete revelation of human possibilities. We cannot conceive of a God superior to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and it is equally impossible for man to conceive of a human being higher and more perfect than He. Jesus has realized the perfection of the life of sonship, which is true salvation.

Call Him therefore by what names you will; heap upon Him all the attributes and titles given Him by the Scriptures—they can not exhaust the meaning and significance of His Person. By every claim of character and achievement, He can be nothing less than Saviour and Lord. "The utmost and the last is in Him." We need nothing more than the perfecting of His life in us, and humanity can never need another revelation to complete its destiny, for there can be no destiny beyond the completion and fulfilment of the gift of life in Jesus Christ.

This then is the second great factor in the problem of salvation—God who loves His people and is ever active for their salvation. The theories as to how He does this are numerous and often divergent or contradictory. But the fact remains unchanged and unchallenged that God can and does forgive sins, and this has been a part of every message of salvation from the beginning of time.

III. The third common factor in salvation is faith. This has always been so. Abraham believed God and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness. "Thou desirest not sacrifice; else would I give it. Thou delightest not in burnt offering. The sacrifices of God are a broken and a contrite heart." Forgiveness cannot be purchased, neither can it be earned by service. Salvation is by faith. "By grace are ye saved through faith." "The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."

But what is faith? As soon as we begin to define, we divide. Faith by itself looks simple enough, and does not seem to be very hard to understand, and yet through theological elaboration it has come about that a great many Christians even have



only a faint hope that their faith is unto salvation. Stripped of its theological verbiage, we know readily enough what faith is. Do we not say, "I have faith in that man, or I would trust anything to that man for I believe in him?" We need no elaborate explanation to make us understand what we mean by such a declaration. We simply express an attitude of trust and confidence toward another. It is not primarily an expression of opinion, but of a state, an attitude, a condition. That is faith in everyday life. By that faith we live daily. The state of confidence and trust in the general integrity of men, in the stability of character and honesty and social organization, lies at the basis of all civilized society.

Why should we make an entirely different word out of faith when it comes to religion? What else is it when applied to religion than such an attitude or state of confidence and trust in God as will lead to conduct naturally harmonious with and properly responsive to that trust.

But instead of this we have constructed an elaborate machinery, whereby alone faith can be created in the human heart, so that many timid souls are afraid that they may unwittingly have slipped a cog or so in the process of getting it, so that they cannot be sure that they have it at all.

And then in addition to this, faith has come to be generally regarded as a correct opinion about religious things, rather than such an attitude of trust and confidence in God, as will lead to a life of devotion and consecration to Him. According to this notion men have been more afraid of holding heterodox opinions than of offending against the moral law. An offense against the law might be forgiven, but according to the last article of the Athanasian Creed, which deals throughout with the profoundest metaphysical and philosophical aspects of our holy religion: "This is the Catholic faith (that is the Athanasian Creed) which except a man believe faithfully (that is truly and firmly) he cannot be saved."

To hold a wrong opinion has therefore been regarded as a fearful thing. It might involve the scoundrel in everlasting punishment. Indeed to doubt even the everlastingness of

punishment was like exposing oneself to just this kind of retribution. To hold an opinion of the Scriptures at variance with the Cannons of the Church was like an affront to God which He would not suffer to go unavenged.

This fact that faith has commonly been made to stand for opinion has made men afraid of having any opinions of their own. It seemed safer to hold the opinions which most other people held, and then if anything went wrong, one would at least have company. At any rate under this view of faith it seemed more comfortable to throw the responsibility of one's opinions on the Church or on the general body of believers, rather than to risk one's eternal salvation by holding opinions at variance with those that the Church approved.

But our age has less and less confidence in the saving efficacy of merely correct doctrinal statements of truth, especially in view of the fact that there do not seem to be any such statements, unless there be some body of believers with arrogance enough to declare all other systems false, and theirs alone true, and whose position would finally be borne out by the verdict of eternity. But surely no sane man or body of men who are acquainted with the history of knowledge would undertake to make such a claim.

All of which, it seems to me, shows that our salvation cannot depend on correct opinions, not upon subscriptions to a given formula, not upon faith in certain doctrinal statements, but upon a faith which unites vitally with God the heart of the believer, and this, I believe, has been the faith of the sincere seeker after salvation from the Garden of Eden to Paul and Peter, and Beecher and Brooks.

Here, then, we have another of the common factors of salvation—even our faith.

IV. The fourth and last factor in salvation that I shall name is character. As sin in its real essence is a condition, a state, a character, so salvation in its real essence is character. While there is much dispute over what is sometimes called salvation by character, there is no question as to the necessity of right conduct in those who profess to be Christians. Paul

taught the necessity of good works as well as James. The Methodist as well as the Roman Catholic insists on right moral conduct in believers. Salvation in the individual therefore does not simply mean deliverance from the guilt and power of sin. That expresses only its negative aspect. It is not enough to feel the removal of a burden. Men must feel that what has been done for them must not remain outside of them; but must be reproduced in their own life. Christian salvation is moral union with Jesus Christ. Christ's attitude toward God and man and the world and sin becomes the saved man's attitude. We invite men to come to Christ, but what do we mean by that. How do men come to Christ? What effect does such an invitation have on the average man? What is his idea of coming to Christ? What else is it than coming to the position, the platform of Christ with reference to the great realities of life and to meet them in the spirit of His life?

We may lay down the tracks on which we insist that this life and power must move, but the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knoweth not whence it cometh and whither it goeth. Salvation is life and power, and these cannot be strictly defined, nor can we explain their origin, except to say that all power is in God and that all life has its origin in Him. Power from the Living God goes out to the believing child for the fulfilment of His saving purpose. God in us; the living Holy Spirit in men—this is the life and power which makes for our salvation.

But what now is it to be saved? We have not yet defined our principal word. I can not do better here than to quote a paragraph from W. N. Clark. "When a man is saved," he says, "according to the Christian doctrine, at least three things occur in his case. First, he is brought out of that wrong and distorted relation to God in which sin had placed him; he receives the unspeakably precious gift of divine forgiveness and comes to his true place as a child of his heavenly Father. He is brought home, henceforth to live at home with his God. Next, under the influence of divine love and truth, by the touch of the divine spirit, the man is brought out of the char-

acter that sin has fastened upon him. He is new-made, and made such as he ought to be. Not at a stroke; but stroke by stroke, step by step, the change comes about. The graces of right character, and the powers that transform conduct take hold upon him, and he becomes what a man ought to be, in godliness and manliness, in purity and truth and helpfulness, in brotherly kindness and righteousness among men. And third, all this is done not in the field of his mortality, but of his immortality, so that he is brought out of the destiny that sin would make for him. Now there is born to him a living hope of endless salvation, growing ever nearer to perfection in the endless life unseen. Thus the man is saved."

These then, to my mind, are the primal factors that enter into the problem of salvation—sin, God ever active in love for man's redemption, faith and character. These have always constituted that common body of facts, present in every message of salvation no matter when or by whom it was proclaimed. The doctrines and theories of the Church in regard to these fundamental facts have varied and changed from time to time, but the facts themselves have remained constant. This of course leaves other matters of great moment, to be yet held subordinate to these elemental facts. In the language of Thomas S. Hastings: "We talk much about the plan of salvation, about saving faith, and about the means of grace, and I suppose we must; but to me there is far more, than in all that conventional and orthodox talk, in that one inspiring verse of Isaiah, 'Behold God is my salvation; I will trust and not be afraid; for the Lord Jehovah is my strength and my song; He also is become my salvation.'"

The Lord's day, the organized Church of Jesus Christ, the Bible and the Sacraments, all these are of great importance, and can only be neglected at one's peril. And yet all these were made for man and not man for them. They are means of grace to assist him in the redemption and salvation of his life.

So also with the doctrines of the Church—they occupy a place of great importance in the Christian life, and yet they

must be kept in their proper place, and must not be made an indispensable part of the scheme of salvation.

We sometimes say, yes, that may be true with regard to things that are not fundamental, but then, *this* is fundamental. What we usually mean by that is that the things which we believe are fundamental while the things which the other fellow believes, are unimportant, and so the famous formula: "In essentials unity, in non-essentials liberty, in all things charity" has amounted to very little. If we could all agree on what the fundamentals are, union would be easy. But to the Baptist, baptism by immersion is fundamental, no matter if the whole of the rest of the Christian world rejects it. That is all the more reason why he should not let it go, since it is fundamental.

The Episcopalian regards Apostolic succession as so fundamental to the validity of religious rites and ceremonies that he can not give it up, even though it should stand in the way of a union of entire Protestant Christendom. And the Menonite with his hooks and eyes regards these as so fundamental, that he must refuse to have any religious association with a man who indulges in such a godless luxury or frivolity as buttons and button-holes.

Now it seems to me that unless every denomination with a peculiarity which separates it from the rest of Christendom is ready to unchurch all who do not believe as they do, the position that these things are fundamental is absurd.

This does not mean necessarily that we should obliterate the doctrinal lines of demarcation between the denominations. Truth is so vast and many sided, that we can only hope to get a glimpse of it here and there, and we must not easily let go the visions that have been vouchsafed to us, but my contention is that we must not set up our partial vision of truth as the whole truth, and we must not make our imperfect apprehension of truth the *sine quo non* of salvation. We cannot stop thinking on the great realities of religion. Nor should we, if we could. The necessities of the mind demand that we should have theories and doctrines about the facts of religion. But let us

be willing to grant that these are necessities for the mind and not necessities for the heart. But with the heart man believeth unto righteousness.

My effort has been to direct attention to what I believe to be universal factors in the problem of salvation, factors that have always been present, whenever and wherever the message of salvation has been proclaimed. I have endeavored to separate these elements from the doctrinal contentions which have gathered about them in history, and from the doctrinal systems with which they have been bound up, in order that we might look at them anew as the outstanding facts of the whole scheme of redemption, with which the preacher must ever deal, no matter what the doctrinal standards of the Church with reference to them may be.

To be able to see and feel sin with sufficient clearness to lead one to look to God in confidence and trust for pardon and salvation, issuing in the beginning and the progressive attainment of a new character, like unto that of Jesus Christ—that is Christian Salvation.

READING, PA.

### III.

## THE ATTITUDE OF PRESENT DAY SCIENTISTS TOWARDS RELIGION.

R. C. SCHIEDT.

MODERN science has given us a new earth, it has defined its proper position in the planetary system, determined its origin, composition and possible age, has disintombed from its everlasting hills the memorials of past ages, has mastered the processes of earth's laboratory, has vanquished space and time, chained nature's forces, taught the vapor to toil, the lightning to speak and the wind to worship; chaos and filth are giving way to order and purity, danger and disease to safety and health.

Modern science is also giving us a new heaven—it has removed the curtain and shows us the creator at work, a benign ruler whose laws are absolute, who does not arbitrarily interfere with the motion of the planets or the gravitational movement of the waters, a progressive spirit, who has unfolded Himself in ever new and increasingly resplendent forms of matter and force, never resting, ever serving and revealing Himself in surprisingly new ways and phenomena. *Modern science has banished old superstitions, animal fear, grotesque conceptions of the heavenly world, beastly ideas of rewards and punishments, childish beliefs and senile ceremonials.* It has on the one hand enormously increased the passion for veracity, for accuracy, for clear statement and plain facts and on the other hand it has, to the same degree, lessened the lust for commercial frauds and the tendencies towards all forms of sham and charlatanery.

Modern science in this sense represents a new stage in the evolution of the race, the stage of the realization of Christian



ideas in an atmosphere of freedom. The polytheism, animism and bookworship of past ages had suppressed the investigation of natural phenomena for thousands of years; scores of the finest minds had perished under the tyrannous lash of primitive religions and Jesus of Nazareth had in vain proclaimed the emancipation of the intellect from the thralldom of ecclesiastical assumptions, the freedom of religion from the categories of science and the freedom of science from the visions of religion. Without the bloody wars of the Reformation and the horrors of the French Revolution, modern science, the ripest fruit of Christianity, could have never matured. It is, therefore, only within the last three quarters of a century that our conceptions of earth, of heaven, of God, of man and of nature have been so completely revolutionized that Socratic speculations and transcendental philosophy have been displaced by demonstrations at oculus et ad hominem. But the age-old domination of religion over science is still manifest, it still demands that scientific men should openly declare their confession of faith or unfaith in the religious formulas of the past, or religion has at least a curious interest in the attitude of modern scientists towards its tenets.

*Two very recent utterances are of great importance in this respect as showing likewise an interest on the part of scientists in religion. They represent at the same time the two most widely prevalent phases of religious attitudes among modern scientists. The one comes from Thomas Edison, the great American inventor, and the other from Sir Oliver Lodge, the noted English physicist. The one is a sweeping annihilation of all the old beliefs in a personal God, in a self-existent soul and in immortality, the other is a restatement of old beliefs in new forms of expression, intelligible to the scientist. The former represents the radicalism of continental Europe as it existed more than a half a century ago, when the new science was in its birth throes and the conflict between the old and the new faith raged most fiercely. The latter represents the reconciliation of the last decade or more, during which noted concessions have been made on both sides. It is a fact worthy of*

note, that of the seventeen leading American men of science, now dead but still present day scientists, perhaps only one held Edison's views, and he was not a physicist, but belonged rather to the biological group of scientists, among whom naturally the eternal questions of the human "whence and whither" have been most widely and most acrimoniously discussed. On the other hand we have the testimony of Asa Gray, the Nestor of American botanists and friend of Charles Darwin, that he is "scientifically a Darwinian, philosophically a convinced theist and religiously an accepter of the creed commonly called the Nicene." Louis Agassiz, the foremost of American naturalists, in his essay on classification says: "All the facts proclaim aloud the one God whom we know, adore and love, and natural history must in good time become the analysis of the thoughts of the creator of the universe as manifested in the animal and vegetable kingdoms." Of James Dwight Dana, first among American geologists, his biographer says: "Dana's character was intensely ethical. And with him ethics was always sanctified and glorified by religious faith. His idea, alike of nature and of human life, was profoundly theistic. Disloyalty to truth was infidelity to God. In his scientific investigations he always felt, like Kepler, that he was thinking God's thoughts after him. Dana was, however, not only a theist but a Christian. Religion was a dominant principle in his life. The influences of his childhood home were strongly religious, and in his early manhood he made public profession of his Christian faith. While residing in New Haven he became a member of the First Congregational Church in that city. His letters written amid the perils of shipwreck and cannibals in the Exploring Expedition reveal the sincerity of his faith in the providential care of a Heavenly Father."

Of Willard Gibbs of Yale, whom the great master mind, physicist, chemist and philosopher, Ostwald calls "the founder of chemical energetics who has given new form and substance to chemistry for another century at least" we read in the *American Journal of Science*, this brief note concerning the

ethical side of his character: "In personal character the same great qualities were apparent, unassuming in manner, genial and kindly in his intercourse with his fellow men, never showing impatience or irritation, devoid of personal ambition of the baser sort or of the slightest desire to exalt himself, he went far toward realizing the ideal of the Christian gentleman. In the minds of those who knew him, the greatness of his intellectual achievements will never overshadow the beauty and dignity of his life."

Rowland, another physicist and renowned Johns Hopkins professor, perhaps the profoundest inventive genius America has produced, who died only a few years ago at the early age of 53, was according to his equally renowned and likeminded colleague Remsen "in matters pertaining to religion philosophic, not emotional. He accepted the underlying principles of the Christian religion and in general his life was in conformity therewith. He lived correctly not because he feared punishment hereafter, not because he had been commanded to, but because he clearly saw that this was the right thing to do. He was as free from anything that could fairly be called sin as anyone I have ever known."

Another John Hopkins professor, a student of Agassiz, called by President David Starr Jordan "the wisest of American zoologists," Dr. William Keith Brooks, has been paraphrased by an English reviewer as to his views on the eternal conception of life as follows: "But supposing the mechanical conception of life to be established, and admitting that the argument from contrivance would thereby lose its force, the attempted proof of the existence of a designer would not on that account be supplanted by disproof. Further, whatever the scientific account of nature may ultimately be, it can throw no light upon the primal cause or the final purpose of the whole or of any part. . . . As to any cause that lies behind the veil of the physical universe science remains forever dumb." More definite and positive are the confessions of Edward Drinker Cope, one of the three great American paleontologists of international repute, of renowned Pennsylvania Quaker stock and

training, but a Neo-Lamareckian in evolution. Of his own beliefs his biographer quotes an extract from a letter written by him in 1886 in which he says: "I learned several things in the time I have lived. Nothing affords so much satisfaction to the mind as the consciousness of having done right, not but that the best people must have regrets for having also done wrong on some occasions. Then we can take comfort in the knowledge that God knows our incapacities and our defects, and pities and helps us; the latter especially if we try to help ourselves;" and again, "I dare not deny a future life and as we all probably wish it, in case it should be happy, we may seek for phenomena which indicate the existence of such a state of happiness in the human mind in this world. If we believe in a development into a future life, we must believe that, as many have gone before us, that future state must be well populated. If this be true I see no difficulty in supporting that communication, and hence prayer is a reasonable thing." Unfortunately there is no positive statement, as to his religious position, extant of Professor Simon Newcomb, by common consent the foremost astronomer of his time and holding the honor of being the World's Nestor of Science on the death of Lord Kelvin. However, we may judge of his general attitude from a remark in his *Reminiscences*, where he says: "I acquired the habit of looking on the characters and capabilities of men as the result of their organism." Joseph Wyman, of Harvard, the great pioneer American anatomist, is described by his daughters as "regularly attending the college services, in vacation the Unitarian Church, and joining the communion, as a lover of hymns, fond of reading the Bible and as distinctly a religious man" and by his biographer "as a man who led a blameless life, thinking always of others rather than of himself and always doing better than he could hope to be done by, enduring the heaviest of all human afflictions with a resignation to which no set forms of piety could have contributed aught of value," and the biographer adds: "Is not this the essence of true religion?" Joseph Le Conte, of the University of California, also of the group of

Agassiz's early students, the most lucid teacher of geological science in America, is the only one who has at length discussed in print the relation of religion to science. In his conception of God he was a theist. Of Christ he says: "The Christ is the ideal man, in whom evolution reached its goal, and therefore the divine man. We are all as men sons of God, the Christ is the well beloved Son. We are all in the image of God; he is the express and perfect image. We are all in various degrees partakers of the divine nature; in Him the divine nature is completely realized. The Christ is undoubtedly a true object of rational worship. There are two and only *two* fundamental moral principles, viz., love to God and love to man. Both of these must be embodied in a rational worship. The one must be embodied in the worship of an Infinite Spirit—God; the other in the worship of the ideal man—the Christ."

The harsh pronouncement of the living Edison forms a broad contrast to the religious attitude of most of the pioneer American scientists, who lived and died within the last three quarters of a century. However, as far as I can judge their scientific knowledge had hardly any more to do with their religious attitude than their early training, family traditions and individual temperament, but we also discern a difference of temporal distance, a difference between Asa Gray, Agassiz and Dana on the one hand and Rowland and Brooks on the other. The wave of European agnosticism, so-called, did not strike the American shores until late in the last century and the traditional Puritan ideas still had their sway over the older men. Could it be possible that this explains Edison's attitude, and is it conceded that Edison expresses the religious views of living American scientists, while Sir Oliver Lodge is the mouthpiece of English men of science? With your indulgence I shall answer these questions by dealing in reminiscences, which of course largely touch the men in my own particular line of work.

In the early days of the Woods Hole Marine Biological laboratory some twenty years ago the most noted biologists

gathered for six or eight weeks in that far-famed corner of the world for investigation and mutual exchange of ideas. C. O. Whitman, who died last November, then of Clark, later of the University of Chicago, one of the five or six most eminent pupils of Louis Agassiz, was at the head of the laboratory in those days. He was virtually the creator of the Woods Hole laboratory and an impelling force as a personality as well as a scientist. Around him gathered such men as E. B. Wilson, T. H. Morgan, Frederick Lee, Henry Osborn and others, now of Columbia University, Wheeler the zoologist and Fowler the botanist of Harvard, Conklin, now of Princeton, McMurrich, now of Toronto, Andrews, of Hopkins, Gardner, of the Boston Tech., Jacques Loeb, now of the Rockefeller Institute, and a dozen others, while such men as Mark Jordan, Ryder, Macfarlane, Conn, Brooks, Verril, Le Conte, Marsh, Hall, Cope and many more lectured occasionally. In those days embryology was the fashion of evolutionary zoologists in America, the mere systematists had been shelved and Darwinism and Lamarckism were tested as to their specific values. Enthusiasm ran high, criticism overflowed, pride over some new discoveries reigned supreme. I had gone through a similar experience ten, twelve years earlier in Germany, and was particularly interested in the effects which evolution, now no longer condemned by Agassiz, had on the general "Weltanschauung" of these men. I felt that the period of storm and stress had come for America and was anxious to know how the old stronghold of orthodox Puritanism would stand the onslaught. I discussed the question of religion with Whitman, who had come fresh from a professorship at the imperial university of Tokio. I asked him what effect Christianity had on the Japanese university students. He grew impatient, shrugged his shoulders and replied, "None whatever. Why should it? It is a matter not worth discussing." He was one of those severe, exact and exacting men whose mind was predominantly open to concrete facts and with whom spiritual things in the Christian sense were mere chimæras. And as he thought, so the majority of biologists thought; they had

absolutely no interest in religious things of the old type and their spirit was caught by their students, even the girls sneered at the assumption of an eternal life in the spirit. Any attempted discussion on my part always resulted in bitter, acrimonious contentions. Such was the attitude towards the Christian religion among most biologists of the early nineties who had come fresh from German universities or had been fed on the biological literature of Germany. It was the time when Ernst Haeckel had assumed the papal throne in matters biological. It was the dominant spirit at the Sea Isle City Marine Biological laboratory under the auspices of the University of Pennsylvania with John A. Ryder as the leading light. And yet when this same John A. Ryder was buried in 1898, I heard the venerable Presbyterian divine and authority on "Ants and Spiders," Dr. Henry C. McCook, in his funeral sermon, say, "that although Ryder did not believe in any of the tenets of the Christian religion he was sure that he would meet his genial friend again around the great white throne as one of the blessed saints of God, because his life had been one long, uninterrupted course of unselfish service and devotion to his fellowmen." I had had many discussions with John A. Ryder, considered one of the most ingenious biologists of his time, on the relation of religion to science, and I had the satisfaction of making him finally acknowledge that after all we only differed in ideals; mine centered in the transcendent importance of things and his in the material, so-called, but that each were of equal value, if we but understood each other's point of view.

However, slowly but surely the attitude of scientists towards religion changed from radical indifference and hostility to silence and restatement of position. Not that the same men changed their opinions radically; the intoxication of their first brilliant achievements, indeed, yielded to a more sober mood, but the belief in the omnipotence of natural selection or the charm of environment had suffered under new tests, the discoveries of Mendel, of Weisman and De Vries had shaken the old Darwinian foundations, the general atmosphere formerly



surcharged with the shouts of purely intellectual triumphs became clarified.

David Starr Jordan, president of Leland Stanford University and supreme authority on fish and fish culture, another of the five or six most brilliant students of Louis Agassiz, became a strong preacher of righteousness, a staunch upholder of that religion which is described as pure and undefiled and consists in visiting the widows and orphans and remaining unspotted from the world, his membership in the Unitarian Church, however, indicates that he is by no means of the old time orthodox persuasion. He is as severe with himself in personal habits as he is in his criticism of others. Sitting aside of him at the table a year or more ago I observed his power of self control in matters of eating and drinking. Knowing that he had been a candidate for the presidency of the United States on the Prohibition ticket I asked him whether he was an absolute radical on this question. He replied: "I neither eat nor drink anything which has no logical scientific relation to normal digestion." The only beverages which he used were water and milk and the only food he ate was of the simplest kind, showing how far he carried his views of a pure and undefiled religion.

Contrary to the former disregard for Sabbath observances I find to-day that both at the Woods Hole and at Cold Spring Harbor laboratories song services are being held every Sunday evening; they are largely attended and generally led by some noted biologist. Last summer I even was requested to address the Cold Spring Harbor assembly on the topic of religion and this year I was booked for six Sunday evening addresses on the relation of religion to science. On careful inquiry I found that a goodly number of the younger biologists belong to orthodox churches acquiescing in but not holding, the orthodox doctrines. A noted biologist, of a noted university, by birth and inheritance a member of the Lutheran church, ventured to speak to me in a half whisper of the unbearable narrowness of his church in doctrinal matters, but he did not seem to have enough interest in things spiritual to speak his mind openly.

Others again took the position that they considered the preacher a theological scientist and expected him to speak as an expert about matters in which they were mere laymen; they thoroughly believed in specialization, which forbids interest in any other sphere of knowledge but one's own.

As universities in America stand to-day I know of but one—although there are undoubtedly others<sup>1</sup>—where the strict Trinitarian views of the old type are held in the scientific department, not by all the members, indeed, but by some of the leading minds, viz., the University of Pennsylvania where the conciliatory spirit of the present provost, the brilliant chemist Dr. Edgar F. Smith, is working wonderful changes in the religious life of the students. Dr. Harshberger, one of the leading American ecological botanists, told me a short while ago on our own campus that he thoroughly believed in the Trinitarian doctrines and considered the fall and the atonement in perfect harmony with evolution. On further inquiry I learned, however, that early training and individual temperament had more to do with his religious views than his science. Perhaps the only type of scientist whose attitude towards religion is largely determined by his science is the radical physiologist, among whom Jacques Loeb is facile princeps. His eagerness to prove that all organic functions are expressions of chemico-physical laws and that there is no such thing as a vital force leads him to a denial of any and all creative activity and with it to the denial of a God and of immortality. Many of them are in full harmony with Edison's agnosticism, but even in Loeb's case it must be remarked that his Hebrew origin and the memory of past and present persecution would partly account for the eagerness to deny the importance of religious factors in human life.

Summing up the American situation of to-day I could say that Edison's sensational agnosticism is not shared by the great majority of scientists, while Gray's orthodox Trinitarianism is sincerely held by only few. The greater number of promi-

<sup>1</sup> The recent book of the great Harvard anatomist, Dr. Thomas Dwight, on *Thoughts of a Catholic Anatomist*, proves that most strikingly.

ment representatives stand on the middle ground of semi indifference, declaring themselves incompetent to discuss the question at all. The most definite utterances do not come in this country from the naturalists but from the physiological psychologists and philosophic thinkers, such as James, Royce, Münsterberg, and others. A series of four articles on "Biology as a Basis of Theology" appeared recently in the *Homiletic Review*, which is the only late contribution of note to our general subject of which I know. Professor George E. Dawson, of Springfield, Mass., shows here how the theological idea of God, the idea of the soul, the idea of immortality and the idea of salvation have been affected and modified by modern biological discoveries, especially by those of cellular biology. But while it is a real contribution to the subject under discussion it primarily presents a philosopher's attitude toward religion rather than a scientist's although the philosopher in question seems also to be a trained scientist.

Let us pass from the attitude of American scientists to those of England and the continent and ask "Does Sir Oliver Lodge represent the European attitude towards religion?" Hardly any more than Edison represents the American, but we may say that he speaks the English scientific mind of the present day more accurately than any other man. His articles in the *Hibbard Journal*, which have appeared in book form under the title of *Science and Immortality* are the only real contributions in the English language to our subject which have been made by a modern physicist. They prove that the English people are still predominantly a religious people and that in the intellectual travail of the race the spiritual factor plays a prominent rôle. Darwin, Spencer, Huxley, Tyndal, Romanes, Lodge and many others—all of them have felt the necessity of expressing their religious convictions in print. Sir Oliver Lodge is perhaps more explicit, more concerned about the importance of religious convictions, but if we finally sift his statements and clear away the dross of words and the bombast of phraseology, his orthodoxy differs but slightly from that of his predecessors. "The Universe," he says, "is the

living garment of God, the substance, the outward and visible manifestation of the great one, the permanent and transcendent Deity of our universe, whose spiritual nature we also share" and again he speaks of "an immanent, energizing God of whom we too are fragmentary, struggling, helpful portions." Charles Darwin expressed the same thought some thirty-eight years ago in a letter to a Dutch student in the following words: "But I may say that the impossibility of conceiving this grand and wondrous universe, with our conscious selves, arose through chance, seems to me the chief argument for the existence of God." Herbert Spencer, who was an engineer by vocation and a science-philosopher by avocation, says in *First Principles*: "The consciousness of an Inscrutable Power manifested to us through all phenomena, has been growing ever clearer, and must eventually be freed from its imperfections. The certainty that on the one hand such a Power exists while on the other hand its nature transcends intuition and is beyond imagination is the certainty towards which intelligence has from the first been progressing." John Tyndall tells us in his Belfast address of 1874, which marks the culmination of the period of storm and stress in evolutionary history, that "it will be wise to recognize religions as the forms of force, mischievous if permitted to intrude on the region of objective knowledge, over which it holds no command, but capable of adding, in the region of poetry and emotion, inward completeness and dignity to man." Romanes, in his *Darwin and after Darwin*, discusses the effect which science has had on religion, and claims that the change science has wrought is a fundamental, a cosmical, a world-transforming change, but a change of a *non-theistic* kind as distinguished from an *atheistic* kind. It has rendered impossible the appearances in literature of any future Paley, Bell or Chalmers, but it has done nothing in the way of negating that belief in a Supreme Being, which it was the object of this author to substantiate. How far he advanced in later years beyond this position is a matter of common knowledge, how much he contributed to the more positive positions of Wallace, Crooks, Henry Drummond.

Lodge and others can easily be surmised. Sir Oliver Lodge defines "life as a guiding and directing principle and when incorporated in a certain organism it and all that appertains to it, may well be called the soul or constructive and controlling element in that organism . . . in higher organisms the soul has lofty potentialities . . . it begins to acquire some of the character of spirit, by which means it becomes related to the Divine Being. Soul appears to be the link between spirit and matter and according to its grade may be linked with one or the other of these two great aspects of the universe. . . . It is the intrinsic reality of anything, while the thing itself may be transitory . . . personality is however not among the transitory groupings . . . a memory, a consciousness and a will constitute a *personality*—it transcends all temporal modes of expression and is essentially eternal whenever it exists. . . . Immortality is the persistence of the essential and the real . . . the conservation of value . . . evolution increases the actuality of values—this carries with it the persistence of personality in all creatures who have risen to the attainment of God-like faculties, such as self determination and other attributes which suggest kinship to deity and make their possessor a member of the divine family."

Sir Oliver Lodge is, however, not orthodox in the generally accepted sense of that term. "Now, that religion," he says, "is becoming so much more real, is being borne again in the spirit of modern criticism and scientific knowledge, may it not be well to ask whether the formal statement of some of the doctrines which we have inherited from mediæval and still earlier times cannot be wisely and inoffensively modified? Consider the doctrine of the atonement and let us ask whether the expression of that doctrine traditionally and officially held or supposed to be held by the churches to-day is satisfactory?"

"In the days when the vicariousness of sin could be accepted and when an original fall of Adam could be held as imputed to the race it was natural to admit the possibility of a vicarious punishment and to accept an imputed righteousness." That was in the days of an angry Jehovah and the wholesale

slaughter of sacrificial animals, in the days of the belief in blood and its potent redeeming efficacy. "As a matter of fact the higher man of to-day is not worrying about his sins at all, still less about their punishment. His mission, if he is good for anything, is to be up and doing and so far as he acts wrongly or unwisely expects to suffer . . . never either consciously or unconsciously will any one but a cur ask for the punishment to fall on some one else, nor rejoice if told that it already has so fallen . . . no one but a monk could have invented the doctrine of original sin . . . we did not make the world and an attempt to punish us for our animal origin and ancestry would be simply comic, if any one could be found to take it seriously." "The vicarious expiation, the judicial punishment of the innocent and the appeasement of an angry God are surely now recognizable as savage inventions. And so likewise the superior virtue of a one-sided human origin for any Redeemer or Exemplar of mankind seems to be unworthy of a period of spiritual awakening. . . . The truths underlying the great mysteries connected with the appearance and work of Christ are among others: the advent of as lofty a spirit as we can conceive, perfectly human on the bodily side, and perfectly divine on the spiritual side, whatever that may mean . . . further, surely a discovery of the truer nature of God . . . of a being whom it was possible to love, to serve, to worship . . . and there was plenty to reveal: an infinitude of compassion, an ideal of righteousness, the inevitableness of law, the hopelessness of rebellion, the power of faith, the quenching of superstitious fear in filial love, a real not a mechanical salvation, no legal quibble but a deep eternal truth."

What I thus have quoted from Lodge represents most accurately the attitude of most of the eminent English scientists of to-day towards religion, demonstrating how thoroughly the results of modern science in its broadest sense have modified on the one hand the views of the old time conservative Englishmen, such as Lyell, Brewster, Balfour and the 210 naturalists who in 1864 declared that there existed no contradic-

tion between divine revelation and the book of nature and that it was very regrettable when the natural sciences were misused by some to deny the truths of Holy Writ, and how on the other hand some of the formerly essential Christian doctrines have been so thoroughly purged from its dross that they have practically become non-essential.

That the racial characteristics and environmental conditions have a good deal to do with particular religious ideas is especially evident when we consider the attitude of German scientists. Their intense interest in the question, their outspoken frankness, their loud bitterness against ecclesiastical shortcomings are not so much results of scientific discoveries and enlightenment, they are rather manifestations of the Teuton character. When in the fulness of time the struggle between the old and the new faith began in Germany, *i. e.*, when in England the period of storm and stress had reached its climax with Tyndall's ever famous Belfast address in 1874 and the warfare that raged around that address, Spencer's synthetic philosophy began to appear in German translations and Ernst Haeckel's *Natural History of Creation* had been on the market for five or six years, a book written largely for the people and read by the people with intense gusto. I remember those days of storm and stress in Germany particularly well; the aggressive spirit of Haeckel had excited the youth of the Fatherland—youth loves a fight—and Haeckel became their hero. Only Prussian Germany could produce a man like Haeckel, straight, energetic, brisk and unforgiving, with the blood of Luther, Bismarck and Nietzsche in his veins. The calm Darwin tried to pacify him, in vain did Huxley admonish him, his fanaticism on evolution knew no bounds. Du Bois Raymond satirized him; His, Goette, Semper, Claus, Loofs severely condemned him; Haeckel never wavered, he replied by calling his opponents hard names. His, he said, had "no capacity for philosophical discussions, Goette's views were infinite nonsense," Agassiz's opinions "charlatanery," Wigand's were "incredible nonsense," etc. He denies all purpose in nature, all vital energy, all moral order or freedom



of man, the universe is only a complex machinery, on which vibrating atoms are the wheels, which now aggregate into a burning sun and now into a beetle, which now chase the planets through the universe and now cause man to act as a thinking and free being. Two forces govern the world: the repulsion and attraction of the atoms. The soul is the sum of all the highly differentiated functions of the central nervous system among which will and sensation are the most important. A creation by God is unthinkable and against all experience; there is no individual immortality, only matter and force remain, there is no God only a mechanism of atoms, there is no soul only physiological nerve processes; the God of the Christians only a "gaseous vertebrate." Naturally the polemic controversies of those days were spicy and Haeckel's influence over his contemporaries immense. Neither Darwin nor Huxley could have procured for evolutionism that world power which it actually acquired; for Darwin lacked the fighting spirit and Huxley the dogmatic mind, necessary to influence the masses, but Haeckel possessed both qualities to a high degree. They helped him to conquer the people and through them also finally the scientists until Haeckel became the leader of biological science and remained such for forty years. Philosophers, sociologists, linguists and finally even theologians such as the Reformed preacher Kalthoff from the pious Wupperthal went over to his camp. Some of the foremost biologists of to-day have been his pupils—Hertwig, Roux, Long, Verworn, Kückenthal, etc. Darwin, Huxley, Gegenbaur, Lankester, Balfour, Wedersheim, Forel, etc., were his faithful adherents. But Du Bois Raymond, the greatest physiologist of his time, in his address of 1872, "On the Limits of Scientific Knowledge," although himself a materialist turned against the materialists and Haeckel, insisting that psychic discussion should be left out of scientific consideration. Virchow, also a liberal, who was satisfied with Voltaire's dictum if only his tailor believed in God, the founder of cellular pathology and a great Berlin professor like Raymond, opposed Darwinism in general and Haeckel in partic-

ular. The high water mark of the controversy was reached during the 50th anniversary session of the Society of German Scientists in Munich in 1877, one of the most memorable meetings of the society, when Haeckel, Waldeyer, Pettenkofer, Nägeli and Virchow participated in the Darwinian controversy. The physiologist Pettenkofer spoke first without touching Darwin, Waldeyer followed with disparaging remarks on Darwinism and then Haeckel arose and delivered his first great public speech on Darwinism and its application to all spheres of life and knowledge, including education, morality and religion. There was dynamite in his speech, and the impression on the hearers was tremendous though not uniform. Finally Virchow arose to answer; his speech was an admonition to moderation, a severe criticism of Haeckel's theory of the plastitule soul, of soul cells, origin of man, etc., and a warning of the dangerous influence of such theories on Socialism, rampant in those days. The effect was tremendous, the long continued applause showed where the majority of the hearers stood. That was the beginning of a change. Haeckel answered in a brochure "Free Science and Free Teaching," the finest product of his pen, but the defeat of Haeckelian Darwinism in Germany had begun. The Darwinian Journal *Kosmos* even did not dare to stand by Haeckel, but admonished its readers in 1878 "to respect the religious feeling in its simplicity and purity, for the mass of the people listens to the Darwinians and remembers only its negative and destructive criticism and overlooks positive statements." In 1882 the journal went out of print. A second Darwinian journal *The Ausland* changed in 1881 its tendencies, when Hellwald resigned his editorship and the Berlin influence had its right of way.

To-day Haeckel's new religion, called monism, according to which God and the universe are one sole substance still has its host of adherents, but a new school of scientists has arisen with Johannes Reinke, the celebrated botanist of the University of Kiel, at its head, which preaches a healthy dualism. "The knowledge of nature," Reinke says, "leads inevitably to the idea of a personal God. The laws of causality demon-

strate as surely the existence of such a God as they do the existence of nature. The sceptic philosopher may declare this statement unphilosophical, the naturalist trained in the methods of induction and analogy finds in tracing the existence and properties of organisms back to a creating deity not only the most intelligible but also the only conceivable explanation. The assumption of a deity is not poetry, but induction. We find Him by the same method by which we find a natural law. Anyone who says there is no deity because it is an impossibility commits in my judgment a scientific frivolity. If anyone should say 'nature becomes incomprehensible through the assumption of a deity, because the deity is to me incomprehensible,' I would tell him that he could likewise argue that nature is incomprehensible through the assumption of gravity because gravity is incomprehensible to the senses. All investigation of nature demonstrates a deity reigning through law and order and not a lawless and anarchistic deity. It is active in the observed laws of all occurrences, its idea represents symbolically a mystery, through which plants and animals have been created. If God is incomprehensible so is our reason although the latter like the former is active within the realm of natural law. God is beyond all definition because we cannot observe and describe Him, but only perceive His works. Both God and man direct the natural forces according to their will and by means of their intelligence, for the God of the naturalist can as little act against natural laws which are his own laws as the God of the theologian can commit sin. Therefore the study of nature *with* God is fully as remunerative, important and interesting as *without* God, and this is true for all branches of science, as is demonstrated by such eminent theists as Galilei, Kepler, Newton, Lavoisier, Wilhelm Weber, Faraday, Linneus, Sprengel, Cuvier, Pasteur, Agassiz and a host of others. Moreover Reinke's God is not only transcendent but also immanent, active in nature. "He is inventor and engineer at the same time. He lives in nature as really as the spirit of the inventor and manufacturer lives in their machine. But he is also transcendent and above every

organism as Edison is transcendent in relation to every telephone. God is a symbol for the sum of all those intelligent and formative forces which are both transcendent and immanent, creating immanence from transcendency." If we finally ask, in how far natural science should acknowledge the idea of God as a scientific factor we must answer: "Natural science reaches only to the borders of theology and no further. No overlapping of the two sciences is admissible, no theosophic speculation or fiction is permissible in the sphere of science. Just as technology does not speak of the technician, so natural history does not speak of God. That belongs to the study of *Weltanschauungen* which lie far beyond the natural sciences."

Karl Camille Schneider, at present professor of zoology at the University of Vienna, goes considerably farther. In his book on the *Origin and Character of Man* he fully agrees with the theory of the descent of man from the catyrrine monkeys but postulated special intervention of the creator God. This God is the "ego" of the world in which all individualities are contained. He applies Kant's, Goethe's and Schelling's transcendental philosophy to his science, making God the highest ideal. The ideals and God are platonic noumena which are above us in perfection, but not principally different from us. They are also incarnated; from time to time individuals arise in the psychic world which are the representatives of the ideals, and are called godman in case of the incarnation of the highest ego. The cause of incarnation is to be sought in love and faith, through which a sort of evolution of the ego is mediated by the concentration of the individualities in the ideals. Such ideals are personalities which are above the egos and our relation to these ideals is different from that to our fellowmen, it is very intimate but different from love, it is a relative of *faith*. We *believe* in ideals but we *love* men. These ideals exercise a much greater influence over us than men; we obey our ideals, we only *sympathize* with our fellows. *Love* makes our deeds moral, *faith* makes them *religious*. Religion transforms our will in a shall, our character into duty—the voice of our ideals is our conscience. Love makes us

conscientious towards our fellowmen, faith towards our ideals. There are many ideals, but God is the highest—and this God is triune, appearing in the *Holy Spirit* as the *thinker* who comprehends the whole world in his reason, in the *Son* as *perfect action* whose conduct serves as the highest example for all men, in the *Father* as a sentient being who annuls Himself and creates the non-ego, viz., His works. Evolution in this sense is the acquisition of the higher will of which we are capable because the will is our ego and faith is only necessary to identify us with the higher ego. The concentration of the individualities in the ideals is the evolution of the ego which is accomplished through love and faith.”

To sum up we find also among present day scientists in Germany a variety of attitudes towards religion most hopeful and most prevalent among which is the latest tendency of accepting the eternal verities of the belief in a personal God and human immortality and declaring them on the one hand not contradictory to the results of scientific investigation and on the other not objects of such inquiry.

I have so far stated conditions; to go into the causes of these conditions would require a second paper of equal length. Suffice it to say, that the old warfare between faith and knowledge has itself undergone a process of evolution. We are beginning to recognize more and more that these two battling queens in the realm of spirit are sisters, children of the same mother—Causality. Having the same origin and the same aim the contention which divides them is merely a quarrel about methods. What to faith is the inner, blessed conviction and assurance, that is to knowledge the hypothesis, the assumption of the reign of law over and in all phenomena. We know now scientifically that they are at bottom identical functions of our psychic apparatus which in either case influence the individual, according to temperament, to focus his logical activities on a central view, a so-called “*Weltanschauung*,” which becomes unconsciously the standard of judgment. There is nothing more powerful in the world of thought than the formula. It carries us with an irresistible power of sug-

gestion and infection into the sphere of its magic cycles, it rallies in epidemic fashion the masses under its banner and creates new epochs of thought.

If evolution is true, thinking itself is a growth, a gradual maturation of the separate elements of our intellectual and sensory organs until a thought is born, *i. e.*, until the resonant surface is finished necessary for the consonance of a number of accords of vibrating ganglionic elements. That generally happens in the fulness of time when the soil of the evolutionary field is sufficiently prepared for the new germ. But such thoughts would vanish like meteorites on the horizon, if not simultaneously or successively other brains would catch the thought and this may happen at once or centuries after, when the spark falls into nervous systems which are specifically sensitive towards the new light. Therefore formulas which have been hidden in the evolutionary furrows of intellectual apparatuses are so suggestive because other brains have been ready for the junction towards which they have grown. If this is true, it must be conceded that all objective truth is subject to change, because at its first appearance it was the truth of an individual, a subjective truth. And such a truth holds its devotees under its suggestive power until a still more forcible subjective combination relieves the old truth. This is the case in the sphere of both faith and knowledge. In great periods of history both faith and knowledge change their garments. The desire to solve the riddles of the universe is in the believer as well as in the scientist the cause of this or that conviction, and we naturally can point to a series of parallels between the revolutionary history of religion and that of science. This is due to the same psychic function, but the difference of temperament and of calling seems to obliterate the original sameness of its direction. A simple example may illustrate my point. When the scientist claims that God is a probable but unproved hypothesis, the earnest believer may answer, that just the reverse is true, for every hypothesis is only an attempt to explain God's thoughts. Science is impossible without hypothesis; we must therefore admit, that there

is a great unknown on both sides, but according to temperament and training men will reverently personify and symbolize on the one side and coolly but logically analyze on the other side, which not necessarily excludes reverence. In either case however, the ultimate cause of all things is an imagined and substituted fundamental power which cannot be investigated, described or empirically recognized. Science assumes a hypothetical ether which penetrates all matter and fills all space, which is practically the same as the belief in the omnipresence of God, scientifically expressed. So is the law of the conservation of energy the same as the age old idea of immortality, only expressed in terms of physical science. If there is such a thing as vital force, and the neo-vitalistic school of modern biology approaches this possibility, then the immortality of intellectual functions no longer lies outside the sphere of scientific thinking. The same parallelism exists between the monism of science and the monotheism of Judaism, between the polytheism of paganism which preceded the latter and the belief in the many imponderables which preceded the law of the conservation of energy and matter. The same is true of the old dualistic ideas of matter and force, of God and Satan, of energy and resistance, all these are only names for the functional processes in our soul, which are deeply rooted in every human brain, whether influenced by priests or by scientists. Moreover, science is just as dogmatic as the Church. The tenacious clinging to old prejudices, traditions and habits is a universal human obstacle to progress whether it is found in church, state or laboratory. We witness the same insane fits of infallibility in either camp, and the popes of science have never been any less intolerant than those of the Church, and are so to-day. There are monopolies of knowledge as there are monopolies of beliefs. The consistent agnostics in science are twin brothers of the atheists. The will to power is no less at work in the sanhedrim of scientific workers than it is in consistories, classes, synods, councils, assemblies and conclaves of the church. Intolerance, the tendency to proselyte, the con-



demnation of men of different beliefs and a thousand other human weaknesses are prevalent here as well as there.

All these examples prove, that the universally human functions of a soul, i. e., the methods of expressing intellectual tendencies, cannot be essentially modified by the one or other profession or calling, that the human soul in its functions is a unit and that all these human weaknesses must occur in every calling; that therefore the priest and preacher cannot act differently in the propagation of his doctrines from the scientist. This is strikingly illustrated by a comparison of priest and physician, who are the typical, popular representatives of religious and scientific ideas. Their business is the specific care of their fellowmen. They both deal constantly with human misery, human sorrow, human grief and human pain. The one uses the uplifting promises of a kingdom of righteousness and happiness which causes all earthly misery to vanish, *the other removes their deplorable conditions by direct chemical alterations of the brain through morphine, narcosis and anaesthetics.* The one hypnotizes through the reflex actions of thought transference the other through the chemical alteration of brain functions; both processes are physiologically closely related and have been experimentally tested, to be due to the same mechanism; both are inhibitions of consciousness. In either case it is the strong, suggestive power of personality which is the most essential factor in the process of priest and physician. Religion as a means of comfort and medicine as a means of cure will not act alone; it requires the personal stimulus of faith to open the gates of the soul and cause the truths of salvation to enter in. When the preacher and priest are accused of Jesuitic methods, much more is the physician open to the same accusation. Where is there a physician who is not guilty of many a "pious" lie, necessary to save or prolong his patient's life.

Medicine also knows its popes and episcopates, the belief in chemistry is as strong and fanatical as that in any religious dogma, and scientific heretics have been executed as often as theological heretics, if they were not burned at the stake, they

have been boycotted, scientifically, materially ruined and finally silenced to death.

But knowledge and faith are much more closely related in a positive sense. *Every true scientist approaches his problems with profound and sacred reverence, psychologically but little different from the humility with which every true priest approaches the altar. And as the true scientist with the increase of his knowledge grows in admiration and wonderment over the wealth of nature's revelations he resembles exactly the religious man who has spent his life in profound meditations. But the great unifying principle of science and religion is the imagination, which relates them both to the realm of art; without the imagination no new idea is possible, no faith probable. The one roams in the realm of reason, the other in that of feeling. Science will never be able to extinguish religious feeling, and belief can never overcome the results of science.*

The warfare between religion and science, an experience of over 20 centuries so graphically described by White and Draper, is on the wane, but we still need to practice mutual tolerance, cherish respect and love for these two twin sisters faith and knowledge, create a reasonable understanding of hypothesis and dogma. Happily the most progressive churchmen freely acknowledge the eminent service science has rendered in the alleviation of human misery and the creation of more rational modes of living, in disseminating useful knowledge and destroying the horrible superstitions of the past; they freely grant science its full share in the creation of a new heaven and a new earth, i. e., in the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth. If religion is service to one's fellowman science has surely done a large part in it. If scientific methods have thrown a flood of light upon the interpretation of Holy Writ and the historic value of dogmas, leaving in doubt what is essential and what is non-essential, the church should desist from the mediaeval barbarism of heresy trials. On the other hand the most thoughtful scientists freely acknowledge their indebtedness to the spirit of Christianity, which opened wide the gates of research and investigation, they humbly con-

fess that there are realms of nature and human personality which lie beyond the ken of human investigation, that dogma is of equal value and of equal necessity with hypothesis, that the origin and beginning of matter and life will forever point to the great hypothesis: "In the beginning God," that this God is immanent in nature, the house of many mansions in which he dwells but over which he also rules through the modes of operation of the omnipresent Divine energy, invariable because perfect; that man's spirit is a spark of Divine energy, individuated to the point of self-consciousness and recognition of his relation to God; that this man alone is a child of God as well as a product of nature; that this new relation requires a wholly different mode of Divine operation, called revelation; that this revelation is most perfect in Jesus of Nazareth in whom God walked on earth and that the society or church inspired by Jesus prepares for that kingdom of God, that realm of reason and justice, of truth and blessedness in which character alone is the perfect attitude of the human spirit towards the divine. In short reasonable science and religion agree upon "unity in essentials, liberty in non-essentials and charity in all things."

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE,  
LANCASTER, PA.

#### IV.

### PHILIPS BROOKS.

FREDERIC GARDINER.

Philips Brooks' ancestry is a most fascinating study for any one interested in heredity. Two strains met in him of which his character shows distinct traces. The Brooks, as far back as we trace their line, were practical men of affairs, men who won a place of respect, and often of office, by their sound judgment and unselfish interest in others. They were of retiring disposition, however, and preferred to look on with keen observation rather than take active part in the politics of their time. They were the kind of men who, successful in business, did not care for great riches, but had strong love for family life.

On the other hand his mother was a Philips, and her ancestors were men with a strong vein of idealism, some of them dreamers and poets. The natural result in the New England of their day was that a large proportion became ministers.

William Gray Brooks, the father of our subject, was a successful business man in Boston. He never took any prominent part in public affairs, even through the stirring times of the Civil War, but he kept a most full and interesting diary, showing that he was a very keen observer with wise and sane judgment.

Mary Ann Philips, the mother, was a woman of most intense emotional nature. Her strong affection centered entirely on her family. She seems to have had little or no interest outside of her husband, her children, and her church. She brooded over them with what seems, sometimes, painful solicitude. The one dominating thought was their religious training and she was never for a moment satisfied until they had given their

complete allegiance to their Saviour and openly avowed themselves His servants by becoming members of the Church. Philips Brooks and the older boys delayed this step till very late. She agonized over them in prayer and her unbounded joy when she at last saw them take the long desired step is beautiful to see. Mother and father together were centers of a most beautiful home life. They shared every thought with their children and the children were brought up to share every thing with them and with each other. The evenings were almost always spent together around the common table, sharing in each other's tasks and the common joys and sorrows. The children never outgrew the feeling that their home was the center of their universe and the mother never ceased to feel that they were still children, needing her care no matter how old they grew. The deepest suffering that Philips Brooks ever felt was the loss of first his father and then his mother.

His education followed the regular plan of a Boston boy of good family—the Latin School and then Harvard. He took particular interest in the Classics and in Harvard stood first in Greek and Latin. In his other studies he made no particular mark but he read widely in English Literature of the Classical period. He seems not to have read as much of the contemporary literature of his time. He was noted especially for the brilliant essays written for the societies to which he belonged. These essays show wide reading and a mature power of assimilating what he read, unusual in a boy of his years. In these essays and his relations with his fellows he already showed two qualities which were his special endowment in after life—observation and imagination. He seemed to be able to comprehend the mind of others by looking into his own soul. It was because he saw himself, straight and true and deep, that he could grasp the heart of others. He was always exceptionally modest and objected to adulation, some of which he was already receiving.

After graduating from college he took a position in the Latin School as usher—that is, master. He proved unable to control his class and was obliged very soon to resign the position.

This failure hurt him very deeply and for a time he retired within himself and his notes of this time show that he was inclined to believe that he was not good for anything. The failure however was not surprising for he had not the qualities to maintain discipline—he always disliked to do things by rule, and disliked the machinery even of church organization. I can remember very vividly, when a teacher in his Sunday-school, how we all dreaded his occasional visits because he was sure to throw the whole system into confusion. In later years, when he was often a delegate to diocesan and general conventions, he was bored to death and seldom sat through them.

He thought a great deal about studying for the ministry during this year but could not make up his mind. It is hard to tell just what was going on within but from his letters later to his younger brothers who were facing the same problem, we may judge that he was deterred by the feeling that he would have to yield his personal independence. Another thing which seems to point the same way is, that, in spite of all his mother's urging and prayers, he was still unwilling to be confirmed. In the fall of the next year he went to the Theological School at Alexandria, Va. Even then he would not become a candidate for holy orders but seems to have regarded it as an experiment. He did not like the school at first and found the contrast between the easy going mental habits of the Virginians and the scholarship of Harvard very trying. He was also very much stirred, meeting for the first time the southern point of view on slavery. The Southerner at this time (1856), was very intolerant of any discussion of slavery and Brooks got himself very much disliked by refusing to be muzzled. His letters home during the first year are very sarcastic of Virginia and her ways but he came later to respect and even love them. He made no particular mark in his studies, in fact considered them rather puerile and uninteresting. He was noted among his fellows, however, for his *prayers* which seemed to them to speak more directly to God than they had been used to hear in their prayer meetings. He had made up his mind at the end of the year that nothing would induce him

to come back, but was finally persuaded to return. His father and mother were the principal influence in this decision which proved a very wise one, as he grew more content and happy in his work. He spent most of his time in the study of literature, history and biography, reading the early Fathers in Greek and Latin.

He made it a rule to keep "thought-books" in which he noted very fully the thoughts which came to him and made quotations from his reading. These thought-books are of tremendous interest because they reappear continually in his sermons of later life. They show maturity of thought and those wonderful qualities of insight and intuition which made so much of the power of his later preaching. He is continually gathering illustrations to use in future sermons. These note-books are also full of his poems. He seems to have found this method of expression most natural when he wished to express deep emotion. He had a natural ear for rhythm and there is every reason to suppose, from the specimens that we find, that he would have made his mark as a poet if he had devoted himself to that form of literature. His early sermons have all the qualities of poetry though taking the form of prose. He valued poetry very highly and in his lecture on "Poetry" to the Howard School he said: "There are times when the dullest souls among us fledge unguessed-of wings and turn to sudden poets. There are brooks whose singing is contagious and sun-rises which turn all live men into Memnon statues. We find poems written in the world that we cannot help reading and singing. Out of as prosaic a car window as your road can boast I saw God write a gorgeous poem this very morning. With a fresh sunbeam for a pencil, on a broad sheet of level snow, the diamond letters were spelled out one by one till the whole was aflame with poetry. I could have defied the deadest soul in that hot car to have looked out of that window and not heard that song of the Almighty sing itself within his brain. If any one of you has written poetry by stealth and is ashamed of it, don't show it but if it came from the heart, thank God who put it into your heart to write it."



The last year at Alexandria he was given the position of teaching the young men preparing to enter the seminary in which he was very successful. He seems to have been able to add this work without diminishing his "tale of bricks" in other lines. This is one of the wonders of Brooks—that he seemed to have always the capacity for more work without sacrificing work he already had in hand. During these seminary years he was working hard and he was growing, intellectually and spiritually, in a wonderful way. During the last year he helped in some of the missions established by the students but seems to have been very much depressed by his want of success. One of his classmates has told me the story of an address which was such an utter failure that, as they walked home afterwards, he did not dare to speak and Brooks seemed buried in deep depression. Suddenly Brooks burst out, "That settles it, I shall never be fit to be a minister," and all that his class-mate could say was "Now, Brooks, don't take it so hard. You may do better another time." One difficulty was his great rapidity of speech, which no matter how hard he tried, he could never overcome. There seems to have been some relation between the speed of his thought and the utterance which expressed it, which could not be safely divorced. Even late in life he was always intensely nervous when he first stood up to preach, and anyone who has heard him will remember the hesitation and that deep breath which he always took before beginning, which was as characteristic of him as the rush of wonderful words which followed.

He was called first to the church of the Advent in Philadelphia but would not accept absolutely and agreed to come only on trial. Another instance of his lack of confidence in his own powers. He was not yet appreciated however. One Sunday evening as he was going home with one of the vestrymen Brooks said to him that perhaps he had better leave at once and not wait till the three months were out. All that his companion could say in reply was: "Well, as long as you have begun you had better stay out the time for which you were hired." Still by the time the three months were out he was

called as rector. He found his work to be something greater, more delightful and beautiful, than he had anticipated. He made many friends, largely through Dr. Vinton, his old rector, among them Dr. Weir Mitchell and his sister. Miss Mitchell, who was a great invalid, continued as long as she lived to be his closest friend. When he was in Philadelphia he saw her at least once or twice a week and discussed his inmost thoughts with her. A thing he did with very few. When he was away they exchanged letters at least once a week and after he left Philadelphia this continued till her death. There seems to have been no one else to whom he opened his soul so completely, and she had a deep influence on his life and thought.

Dr. Vinton, his old pastor in Boston, now rector of Holy Trinity, Philadelphia, was the first to appreciate the originality and power of his preaching and gave him frequent opportunities from his pulpit. Increasing numbers crowded to hear him. When Dr. Vinton resigned he was called to take his place and, though he felt the leaving of Advent, there was no question of the larger opportunity thus opened to him, and very reluctantly he accepted. The next nine years were the happiest of his life, full of the abounding activity, delightful social intercourse, and growing power in his church work. The first part of this period covers the Civil War, into the questions and work of which he threw himself with all his power. He was constantly at the call of every good work and a leader in the reform of city evils, a pastor of all the soldiers stationed at or passing through, Philadelphia. (The negroes particularly appealed to him.) He came to be known as the "pastor of the soldiers" and his ministrations were sought after with great eagerness and remembered with deep gratitude. This was the only way in which he could make himself directly felt in the war. He had the strongest desire to be doing something practical for his country in this war, which took a strong hold on his feelings. One amusing incident illustrating this happened at the time of Lee's invasion of Pennsylvania. He was disgusted with the indifference of Philadelphia and of the lack of any preparations by the authorities to meet a

possible attack. He gathered some of his brother clergy, armed them with pick and shovel, since they could not carry fire-arms, and they offered themselves to the authorities to do what they could. The act was effective and, though they did no actual work, stung Philadelphia into a sense of its supineness. He went up to Gettysburg after the battle and ministered to the sick and dying of both armies for several days.

The intensity of feeling which the war aroused in him seems to have increased his powers. There was a strange identification of himself *with* his country. He felt her as if she were a personality and so entered into her spirit as to be able to express what was in her heart and mind as few others. He seemed to feel, too, that he somehow *embodied* this spirit. This power was recognized more and more by the people and reached its highest expression in his Thanksgiving sermon after Gettysburg and in that on the death of Lincoln. It is necessary to emphasize this power of his of entering into public life and public questions because later he deliberately cut out this connection in order to perfect himself more completely in what he felt was his real work. He might have been one of the great moving powers in our national development, an authority like Beecher in awakening the civic conscience. He deliberately confined himself to the spiritual side, believing that the higher and more important. There were always men who could make the application of spiritual principles to practical life; in fact each man whose spirit is alive and growing must make those applications for himself.

One incident of his Philadelphia life is of interest as bringing out his desire for a more intellectual life. It was years before he ceased to long for the life of the scholar in place of that of the preacher and pastor. He felt terribly the tax on his time and how little opportunity he had for real study, yet very few pastors accomplished the amount of study which he regularly found time for. But he was never satisfied with himself in this respect. The call to the chair of history in the Philadelphia Divinity School, like the call later to Harvard College, attracted him immensely. It seemed just what he

really wanted and needed. Now, as later, it was only the fierce protest which was aroused by those who had been helped by his preaching and who felt that they could not live without him, that made him reluctantly give it up. It was easier this time than at the Harvard call. One can easily understand that the Harvard call would draw him as no other intellectual opportunity. I can remember very vividly the intense feeling aroused in Boston and Cambridge. We at Harvard felt, of course, that there could not be any larger sphere for the greatest man than Harvard could give. No influence was left unused to bring him to our point of view. On the other hand, the whole people of Boston cried out for him not to leave them. Not the refined and intellectual people alone but the common people. He was deluged with letters from clerks, mechanics and day-laborers, whose names even he did not know, who told him the inmost secrets of their lives and of how his words had reached them in darkness and despair and made new men of them. He did not finally settle this struggle in his own soul between the demands of what seemed two sides of his life until his long vacation in Europe, when he was forty-six. In that long period of study and contemplation he grasped and made his own the larger unity in which both the intellectual and the emotional find their completion. Then only he at last found rest from the struggle. A brief note of his during that year commenting on another man's life seems to express exactly what we would want to say of his own. "It is not the intellectual man as such, not the man in whom intellect stands crudely forth as the controlling element in life, that other men are drawn to most. The greatest men that ever lived are those in whom you cannot separate the mental and moral lives. You cannot say just what part of their power and success is due to a good heart and what to sound understanding. And in every circle there are apt to appear some persons of great influence and great attractiveness, of whom you never think as being specially intellectual; it startles you; but as you think about your wonder, you discover that it does not come from an absence of the intellectual life in those who are thus spoken of,

but from the fact that the intellectual part of them is so blended and lost in the rounded and symmetrical *unity* of their life that you have never been led to think of it by itself."

The same thought is expressed by him in his lectures on the "Influence of Jesus":

"And in them all there is wrapped up this, which is the truth of all the influence of Jesus over men's minds, that where Socrates brings an argument to meet an objection, Jesus always brings a nature to meet a nature,—a whole being which the truth has filled with strength, to meet another whole being which error has filled with feebleness."

It was this complete welding of two sides of his nature—one of which only is developed in most men—into a higher unity which made his supreme greatness as a man. We shall study later the qualities which made him a great preacher, but all these qualities would never have produced the effect if he had not been something greater yet—a man. Few men have had his unique influence because few men have ever so completely developed the fullness of their manhood. He won this completeness of manhood only by a long and hard struggle which left its mark on him. Few men have been so singularly free throughout their life from suffering from outward circumstances. The intensity of the struggle from within was even more effective in the perfecting of his character through suffering. Dr. Weir Mitchell, than whom no critic is more competent, both for his keen judgment of men and for his intimate knowledge of Brooks, has said:

"I have known a number of men we call great,—poets, statesmen, soldiers,—but Philips was the only one who seemed to me *entirely* great. I have seen him in many of the varied relations of life, and always he left me with a sense of the competent largeness of his nature."<sup>1</sup>

There is another aspect of his complete manhood that it would not be right to omit,—his abounding joy in life. This was partly because he was always a boy. He really never outgrew his boyishness. I can well remember when he was forty-three he expressed his longing to dine at Memorial Hall.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Allen.

I was of course only too delighted to give him the invitation. When he arrived, he looked through the glass doors and seeing the seven hundred students at their meal, he drew a deep breath and cried out, "Oh, I wish I was a boy!" In these Philadelphia days he was full of just animal spirits, showing in whimsical humor and what some people would call undignified fooling. In fact he was very much criticized for what seemed to many quite undignified conduct for a minister. I suspect he rather enjoyed shocking conventional people—he never had much use for convention and was always ready to protest against any convention which savored of unreality. He despised the idea that a minister must go around with a solemn face. A letter of his to Dr. Mitchell will give something of the flavor of this spirit:

"Dear Weir,—

"What a good fellow you are! And dear me how many years ago it is since you began to be a good fellow,—or rather since I began to know what a good fellow you were, when you were a young doctor and I a young parson, and the world so much less aged than it is to-day! You never did a kinder thing than when you offered me your house and home, bread, board, and cook, for three weeks' convention time. Not that I can accept it . . . but I thank you just as truly as if I had been able to come and break all your choicest furniture and drink all your rarest wines. You do not know what you escape by my being unable to do the tempting thing that you propose. Think of what your house would have had to undergo after we left it! You would have found fragments of broken dogmas under the chair cushions and skeletons of sermons in all your bedroom closets."<sup>2</sup>

There was ever growing, however, a deeper reason for this joy in life,—his possession of the abiding joy of the Christian assurance. He never tired of preaching of this joy as the mark of the true follower of Christ. This abiding joy which he never lost throughout life came from a sense of his nearness to

<sup>2</sup> Allen.

God. Few men have had such a sense of living with God, in living and immediate touch with Him, as did Philips Brooks. It almost radiated from him when you met him. This living with the present God showed in his extemporaneous prayers, even in his theological school days. His schoolmates were impressed with the marked difference between his prayers and that of other men's. One of his classmates says: "We had never heard such prayers, so fervent, trustful, simple, so full of what we should not have guessed was in him, till he testified beside us on his knees." Every one felt when they heard him pray that here was someone who was speaking to a Being who was *real* to him, a Being whom he believed in, loved, and lived with continually. There are two public prayers of his, both brought out by the intense feeling of the Civil War, which show the high-water mark of this power. His emotions seemed to have been hammered by the stress of that period to a white heat and he seemed to be able to gather into himself the full expression of the soul of the nation as it spoke to its God. The first of this was on the steps of Independence Hall at the close of the war, and the other in the great tent in Cambridge on Commemoration Day. On both these occasions he rose to a height which even surpassed himself. He seemed to gather all the experience of those five years, all the suffering and agony he had been through for his country, all the joy in his country's vindication, in her robes now cleaned of the defilement of slavery, all his wonderful sympathy with the offering of the people's best for the cause. He was lifted out of himself and poured it all forth in those inspired prayers which left a never to be forgotten impression. Anyone who has heard Philips Brooks pray can perhaps picture something of what that prayer might have been of which Colonel Higginson says that "when he saw the name of Mr. Brooks on the programme, he wondered why a young man of whom he had never heard should be so chosen. He put himself in a mood of endurance through what he regarded as a dull formality. But with the first sentence from those burning lips, his attitude changed. He found himself listening breath-



less. He felt that he had never heard living prayer before; that here was a man talking straight into the face, into the heart of God. When the "Amen" came, it seemed to him that the occasion was over, that the harmonies of the music had been anticipated, that the poem had been read and the oration already uttered, after such a prayer every other exercise might well be dispensed with."<sup>3</sup>

The move to Boston in 1869 at the age of thirty-three, opens a new period in his life. He had twice refused this call in spite of the strong pull of his love for his mother and father who longed very much to have him at home. There was everything of course to draw him to Boston, it was the home of his family and his ancestors, and he had been steeped in its atmosphere. The exile from Boston's atmosphere is never quite reconciled however much he may learn to love some other place. The work to be done for the Master in Boston must have called to his nature with peculiar strength and at last he yielded.

But it was very hard to leave Philadelphia. He had learned to love it and her people. Philadelphia had taken him to her heart and he had responded with all the warmth of his. He was never as happy again anywhere else and he always looked back with longing in after years to his Philadelphia days.

It is well to pause here perhaps and try to make some estimate of his powers as a preacher because he made a decided change in his method of preaching when he moved to Boston. His reputation as a preacher had been steadily growing through the years in Philadelphia. Not only were crowds regularly turned away from Holy Trinity but his fame had spread over the country. He had received urgent calls from California, from Detroit, Cleveland, New York and Boston. The effect which his preaching produced was unique. The reports in the newspapers speak always of something strange and surprising, something which seemed new and unexplainable. They all mention of course the unpleasant rapidity of his delivery, his splendid physique, and sympathetic voice, but all seem to feel some quality which they do not quite know how to express. This quality produced results in the lives of those to whom he

<sup>3</sup> Quoted by Allen.

preached and that I suppose is the real test of the effectiveness of preaching. An analysis of these qualities and powers is extremely difficult but must be attempted. In the first place there was a literary quality to his sermons which perhaps was an original endowment, but which had been carefully and systematically cultivated since his boyhood days. It had been an aim kept steadily before him to perfect his literary style, and he thought no pains and labor too great to spend upon it. This literary quality was perhaps only unconsciously felt in listening to his rapid delivery. There was generally no time to grasp more than the richness of the thought. It is only when you study the printed sermon that you realize how perfect is the diction, how beautiful the rhythm of the sentence. His poetic qualities are felt all through it. Each sentence is a picture, sometimes merely suggested by the use of the words, sometimes more fully developed, but the effect is to produce on the mind a series of pictorial impressions such as the true poet gives. It is hardly necessary to say that this is a most effective way of imparting truth. His sermons also had, that which is the highest perfection of literary style—a *unity of perfect simplicity*. With the peculiarity of his delivery one would almost expect a turgid eloquence but instead we have the clearness of a crystal stream or of a far-sounding bell. All this helped the mind to grasp the truths that he preached but they were not the real power that brought them home.

One thing in his preaching that was startling to his generation, might seem commonplace to us. This was his continually trying to relate theological truth to life. The ordinary preaching had been what we commonly call dogmatic or else hortative. Truth was supposed to be an end and aim in itself but its direct relation to life was lost sight of. A truth to Brooks had no meaning or value until he could see how men had lived it or could live it. He had no interest whatever in the discussion of abstract truth as a matter of opinion. What is generally called "dogmatic theology" seemed to him dry, if not ineffectual. He was always silent when discussions of that kind were going on; but he would think them out until he could see them

as living truths. He would meditate over them, brood over them, he would bring to bear his splendid intellect and his intense emotions until a spark seemed to light them into living fire and you could see the glow even in his face. Then to present this truth most effectively he would use his intimate knowledge of human history, all his wonderful insight, intuitive and cultivated, into the human soul, to illustrate and enforce them.

A passage from his notes will show this eager desire to enter into the lives of those about him, and also give us a glimpse as it were of the working of his mind out of which came the sermon: "In all this traveling one is overcome and oppressed with the multiplicity of life. The single point where we stand is so small, yet it is the best and dearest of all. I would not for the world be anything but this, if I must cease being this in order to be that other thing. But I would fain also be these other things,—these college students, these soldiers in their barracks, these children playing around the old fountain, these actors in their dotage, these merchants in their shops, these peasant women at their toil, these fine ladies with their beauty. I want somehow, somewhere, to be them all! and the simplicity, the singleness of life, with its appointed place and limits, comes over me oppressively. Where is the outlook and the outlet? Must it not be in the possibility, which is not denied to any of us, of getting some conception of life which is large enough to include and comprehend all these and every other form in which men live, or have lived, or will live forever? And is not such a conception to be found in Christ's large truth of God the Father? Oh, to preach or hear some day a worthy sermon on 'In Him we live and move and have our Being.'"

Let me quote here an English opinion of his preaching which will better express what I have been trying to say. "We are disposed to assign to Mr. Brooks the rank of the first preacher of our day. Or, if that be too strong a statement, we shall mend it by saying that his printed sermons are

the best we have ever read. They are, without exception, great sermons. Of the fourteen sermons in this volume, it may be said that they are great in all respects. Great in the gravity of their solemn eloquence, great in the felicity with which word is fitted to thought, and perfect simple expression is given to deep and profound thought; great also in the insight into character, motive, and action, and especially great in the act which presses thought, speech, emotion, into one organic whole. Each sermon stands out clear and vivid before us, perfect in the one simple expression it makes on our mind. It is only as we proceed to analysis that we discover how much complexity and variety have gone to make the unity which is perfect as the unity of a true or of a living organism. There is boundless variety, manifoldness of many sorts, but all held together by a principle of life from within, and not of outward constraint."<sup>4</sup>

But behind all this, was the real power which brought all he had to say home to the hearts of the people and lifted them out of themselves, that is, the man himself. While he always spoke impersonally in his sermons there are few who ever laid bare their own souls more completely to help others. There seemed to be something correlative in his extreme reticence in his social intercourse and his entire giving of himself in the pulpit, and it was because he knew his own soul so thoroughly, because he saw so straight and true, because, unlike most of us, he *would* see things as they really were, that he could speak to the souls of others in words that they recognized as true at once. And the soul out of which he spoke to them was a soul that really lived with God, that was seeking after holiness with an intense longing, with a struggle as fierce as many a man expends on the overcoming of gross sin. It was the man in the fullness of his manhood giving himself to men; but it was a manhood not only strong and vigorous, full of life and power, but purified and holy.

In his lectures on preaching he shows that this giving of himself was not merely instinctive but of deliberate purpose.

<sup>4</sup> Quoted by Allen.

He says: "There is something beautiful to me in the way in which the utterance of the best part of a man's own life, its essence, its result, which the pulpit makes possible and even tempts, is welcomed by many men, who seem to find all other utterance of themselves impossible. I have known shy, reserved men, who standing in their pulpits, have drawn back before a thousand eyes, veils that were sacredly closed when only one friend's eyes could see. You might talk with them a hundred times and you would not learn so much of what they were as if you heard them preach once. It was partly the impersonality of the great congregation. Humanity, without the offence of individuality, stood before them. It was no violation of their loyalty to themselves to tell their secret to mankind. It was a man who silenced them. But also, besides this, it was, I think, that the sight of many waiting faces set free in them a new clear, knowledge of what their truth or secret was, un-snarled it from petty circumstances into which it had been entangled, called it first into clear consciousness, and then tempted into an utterance with an authority which they did not recognize in an individual curiosity demanding the details of their life. Our race, represented in a great assembly has more authority and more beguilement for many of us than a single man, however near he may be. And he who is silent before the interviewer, pours out the very depths of his soul to the great multitude. He will not print his diary for the world to read, but he will tell his fellow men what Christ may be to them, so that they shall see, as God sees, what Christ has been to him." (*Lectures on Preaching.*)

In moving to Boston he came into quite a different atmosphere from that which he had left, intellectually more stimulating, socially not so congenial. He was coming back into the environment in which he had been brought up and also coming in touch again with his mother and father. This was a great joy to him and his devotion to them in the midst of the pressure of his duties was beautiful to see. But in spite of it all he seems to have felt his loneliness more than in Philadelphia. He used often to say that he ought to have been married and how

much he felt his loss in not having wife and home. Why he did not marry I suppose we shall never know, but one cannot help but feel that the loneliness of his life which he felt very strongly, in spite of his many friends and their warm admiration, had much to do with shortening his life.

When he took up his work in Boston he resolved to drop all work outside his parish. It was not that he took less interest in civic affairs but that he felt that he needed all his powers for the supreme work of preaching which he now recognized as his special talent. He refused to give addresses or write papers for any secular occasions except those connected with schools. Not long after his arrival the Boston fire destroyed old Trinity Church and the project of building a new one, which had been under discussion for some time, became a necessity. He resolved that this new church should be a splendid monument of what the parish stood for and his parish nobly seconded him in all his plans. But the building proved to be a very much longer operation than was expected and meanwhile the congregation had to worship in Huntingdon Hall. This was a severe test of Dr. Brooks' power of holding his congregation. The hall was in use for other purposes all the week and could not be made to look like a church in any way. Yet it was wonderful to see the crowds that came to hear him. It was seldom, even on a rainy Sunday, that the corridors and even stairways leading to the hall were not filled. He kept up his pastoral work very faithfully through all the disturbance and confusion, and was always at the call of any one in physical or spiritual distress. It seemed sometimes to his friends as if his time was terribly frittered by unnecessary calls. There were many ladies in Boston whose troubles of conscience, if not imaginary, were of little importance, who still insisted upon writing or calling upon him for advice. He refused to slight any of them and always scrupulously answered every letter. That he felt this tax upon his time there is no doubt. I remember being in his study once when he was pouring out some of his beautiful thoughts and we were interrupted by a ring at the bell and a card was brought in. He was gone for

half an hour and came back with clouded brow, stamped into the room, and when I asked, "Why, Doctor, what is the matter?" he said "Oh, some more of those women."

Two books which express the man more fully than anything else were his "Lectures on Preaching" delivered at Yale in 1877 at the age of forty-one and the "Influence of Jesus" delivered in Philadelphia in 1879. The greatest charm of the Yale lectures is that they are really an autobiography of Philips Brooks, the confessions of a great preacher. Allen says of them: "The book is personal throughout. He speaks often of himself freely in the first person, though at other times he veils the revelation. Always he is giving the result of his own reflections and observations of life. It is a book which owes nothing to its predecessors in the same field, of which there are many. He confined himself to preaching as *he* had experienced its working, or studied its method, or observed its power. He recalls how he had come very early to the conclusion that what was desired in the ministry, as the condition of effective preaching, was the combination of learning and intellectual force with the capacity for devout and deep and intense feeling."

In order to understand the purpose of Philips Brooks in writing the "Influence of Jesus" which was the Bohlen Lectures for 1879, we must stop to review the condition of religious thought at the time. It is hard perhaps for one of this generation to understand the seething unrest of the religious world of thirty years ago. Though those of you who have lived through it will recall it vividly. It was not only that scepticism was the fashion of the world and the pride of the sophomoric student, but that the earnest religious men felt the foundations on which their life depended shaken to their depths. Spencer had declared with authority that the God whom they worshipped could be only an "unknowable first cause" and Huxley had poured the vials of his keen sarcasm on all which they thought the most precious things of their belief. He had declared that the idea of a revelation was not only impossible but that it was of no more interest to mankind than the mes-



sage from the moon. Tyndale and others had seemed to support these positions with the authority of science, and the German and Dutch investigators, with the authority of a new history. According to what seemed the accepted ideas of the greatest minds, the world was utterly material and man an automaton moved by physical forces beyond his control. Prayer and miracle were of course impossible in such a world.

Nor was it only on the intellectual side that doubts were the current food of thinking, but the unthinking mind of the common people was disturbed by the ranting of Ingersoll. He went up and down through the land throwing his vulgar and shallow criticism against everything that men held most dear. It did not matter to the men of those times that we to-day can see the reason for his attitude in a reaction from his early education, or that we know that many of his criticisms were justified in their essence if not in their form. It seemed then as if he were tearing down the pillars of the house and the whole beautiful fabric in which their fathers had lived and worshipped was falling in ruin about them.

Within the sacred confines of theology itself there was also doubt, unrest and bitter fighting. The question of inspiration seemed then to be bound up with the settlement of the questions of authorship and authenticity of the books of the Bible. The rising tide of higher criticism was being fought tooth and nail by the conservatives, who felt that they could not let go one iota of the ideas of the Bible, as they had been taught them, without danger of losing their whole belief. One particular argument of this conservative attitude was that as Jesus had quoted the Old Testament in certain ways that must settle entirely our attitude towards these questions. In this way the authority or knowledge or even sincerity of Jesus was called into question.

Philips Brooks never argued about these matters of controversy. You might have heard or read all his sermons without noting a mention of any of the current doubts; but yet you will find that they are constantly in his mind only he gives the positive outlook *from* the doubts and not the contro-

versal answer to them. So in the "Influence of Jesus" he is presenting to us a Person, a living Person, in living present relation with man, who is the answer to all doubts. Instead of the God whom the preachers before him had presented as a God of power and justice and holiness, Brooks presented Jesus to men as their loving Brother, leading them with his own hand to a Father who is waiting for them. These lectures are a presentation, or better a study, of Jesus as He gives us a living example of this idea in the four great aspects of human life—the moral, the social, the emotional, and the intellectual. Brooks with beautiful simplicity shows us how this idea of Sonship can solve all the problems of life. "The power of Jesus is the idea of Jesus multiplied and projected through the personality of Jesus." He gave what the times needed—not argument but a life. It was not that he discredited dogma,—he was very clear and positive in his own belief in dogma. He did not stand with the so-called leaders of liberal thought with whom some people tried to identify him. He explains this point himself very clearly in *Essays and Addresses* as follows: "And what is another question that is before us perpetually? It is the question of the separation of dogma and life. Men are driven foolishly to say on one side that dogma is everything, and on the other that life is everything. As if there could be any life that did not spring out of truth! As if there could be any truth, that was really felt, that did not manifest itself in life! It is not by doctrine becoming less earnest in filling itself with all the purity of God; It is only by both dogma and life, doctrine and life, becoming vitalized through and through, that they shall reach after and find another. Only when things are alive do they reach out for the fullness of their life and claim that which belongs to them."

This idea that a life of loving obedience to Jesus and a glorious sharing of his life, because we also are sons, is a commonplace of to-day but we must not forget that we owe its general acceptance largely to Brooks. We may have advanced to a wider and fuller idea of our sonship perhaps, "If sons, then

heirs" and therefore fellow workers in his kingdom. Brooks' conception may be pictured as that of the child with his hand in the hand of his father, ours that of the grown son, partner in his father's business.

To the men of his times Philips Brooks' preaching was a veritable new Gospel, coming as a light in darkness, an uplift in despair. They seemed to be floundering in a slough of despond in which there was no solid ground to stand on. He pointed them to a path, firm and clear, which though it had been there all the time they had not seen till he pointed it out to them. Men of every rank of life rejoiced in him, from the highly cultivated Boston intellect to the simple minded hod-carrier. To be in Trinity Church on a Sunday, particularly a Sunday afternoon, when he preached extemporaneously, was to see all sorts and conditions of men crowding every inch of space and hanging breathless on his words for an hour or more. The setting itself of the scene was magnificent. Richardson in building Trinity Church had shown the capacity of entering into the needs of the great man who was to lead the worship there. It is a church of great spaces, both outward and upward, which impresses one with breadth. The four huge columns that support its central tower express strength and sureness. It is so arranged too that everyone of the vast numbers that it holds hears and sees. And Brooks was built on a mould that seemed peculiarly appropriate when he stood up before that crowd. He himself seemed to feel the inspiration of the listening multitude. He would stand for a moment silent, drinking in that inspiration as it were, and his first words were sometimes slow and hesitating, but he soon gathered power from the intense attention and his words came faster and faster until they poured out in that rush of eloquence which carried everybody with him. The impression that he made could be seen in the congregation as they dispersed. There was a silence and quietude as if men and women had been stirred to think as never before. There was a light in their faces which showed that a new and blessed thought had come to lighten their lives. One would often see them draw a long

breath as if they had not had time before in the intense concentration of listening.

The power of his preaching was not confined in these days to Boston or even America, he made the same impression in his frequent visits to England and his influence was extended by his published sermons. Something of this wide influence can be gathered from some of the letters received from his English hearers: "Your visit to us this summer," writes a high dignitary of the Church of England, "has left a mark, spiritual and intellectual, which by God's help, will not soon be effaced from the church which welcomed you and delighted to listen to you. And we, who have to preach and teach, feel that a prophet has been among us, and a new stimulus given us, for which we are heartily grateful and solemnly responsible." "My gratitude," writes another, "has grown and deepened, and now cannot find the proper and suitable words in which to express itself." "I can assure you," writes a member of the legal profession who heard him in the Temple Church. "I will never forget the lessons of charity urged upon us. The older I get, and the more of the world I see, the more I am convinced that if Christianity is to lay hold on the higher order of intellects, it must be by such noble, broad, elevating preaching as yours."

An undergraduate at Oxford describes the impression made when he took his degree: "More than any man I have ever known Philips Brooks possessed that which commanded instant trust, complete confidence,—a power, not only the outcome of a splendid physique, eloquent of strength and protection, of a broad, quick and ever sympathetic mind, but of a great heart filled with love for all his fellowbeings, a love blind to all differences of class and race and which, shining from his kindly eyes, lit up his face with a smile and made him God-like. I was an undergraduate when Oxford conferred the degree of D.D. upon him and I shall never forget him as he appeared before the vice-chancellor clad in his gown of crimson and scarlet, nor the surprise which many of my Oxford friends regarded his splendid athletic proportions and his

perfectly formed head. In applauding Philips Brooks men did not merely applaud a famous preacher. The praise was not by the scholar, the artist, or the athlete, but by those who felt instinctively when they saw him that here was a man as God intended a man to be."

Of the episode of his episcopate I do not need to speak much. He had been twice before elected to the episcopate. In one sense it was the crowning of his life because it was the gift, not only of his church, but of the people of Massachusetts, of the best that they had to give. But on the other hand it made no real change in his life or work and was all too short to give the possibility for an enlargement of his powers. It was less than two years before his great heart was worn out under the added strain and he passed quietly away in January, 1893, at the age of fifty-seven. There is perhaps no better comment on his life than the feeling with which everyone heard of his death. It was not the sense of loss that was first but the feeling of how perfectly natural it all was. Here was a child of God who had lived close to him here on earth and now had just gone home. There was no sense of rebellion, not the feeling that something had been taken from us, but that he had gone to live now where he had always belonged.

Philips Brooks was great in the power of a holy life—great in the dominating power of his spirit which so ruled his whole nature as to build it into a perfect *man*, the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. He was as truly a pioneer and an empire builder in the things of the spirit as Rhodes in material things. He blazed the way for multitudes out of the terrible forest of doubts which beset the world at that time and led many, from all over the world, out of the darkness into the light. One of the great religious leaders of his generation, a genius in the things of the spirit. I cannot close this paper better than by quoting from Dr. Parks, one of his friends in Boston.

"So we parted after a friendship of fifteen years,—friendship made possible only because of his deep sense of the value of the individual soul, which made him very careful not to

dominate a younger and less gifted life. As I look back over the years of delightful communion with him, nothing seems to me more striking than the *unity* of his character. He died just as he had lived,—the keen sense of humor, the scorn of pretentiousness, the love of literature, the ignorance of pain, the shrinking from death, the love of life, the humility that counted others better than himself, the loving heart that loved to the end. All these were shown in the long years that I had known him; they were shown in the last half hour that we talked together. He died as simply, as naturally, as lovingly, as he had lived. It is that same man whom we hope to see."

YEATES SCHOOL,  
LANCASTER COUNTY, PA.

V.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CLOSER  
UNION WITH THE PRESBYTERIAN  
CHURCH IN THE U. S. A.

GEORGE W. RICHARDS.

It is my purpose to offer an explanation of certain aspects of the Report on Union which was adopted by the General Synod at Canton, Ohio. The adoption of the Report involves the reference of the Plan of Union "to the Subordinate Judicatories for information and discussion as an acceptable plan for future action subject to such modifications as conditions may require." Statements which have appeared in the daily papers, assertions which have been made in conversation and in synodical discussions, and questions which have been asked by ministers and members in regard to the proposed union, have convinced me that neither the Report nor the General Synod's action on it are clearly understood.

While the Eastern Synod was in session in Philadelphia, the following squib appeared in the *Public Ledger*:

REFORMED SYNOD TAKES UP MERGER WITH  
THE PRESBYTERIANS.

"The merger has already been favorably acted upon by the General Synod of the Reformed Church at its meeting in Canton, Ohio, last May, but each of the six Synods will also have to take favorable action. The Presbyterian General Assembly voted for the union at its session in Atlantic City last May."

In the discussion of the report of the Committee of the Eastern Synod on the subject of union, the Joint Committee was criticized for not submitting a sufficiently definite plan of



union, not even a name for the proposed United Church. Another question, frequently discussed in public and private, was whether the Plan of Union practically means a merger with the Presbyterians, or whether it is a modified form of federal union in which each church substantially maintains its identity after the union.

Since the Joint Committee and the Supreme Judicatories of the two churches invite discussion of every phase of this subject, I shall attempt to throw light on some points which seem to be obscure, and at the same time set forth my personal views; for I believe heartily in the principle presented by Pericles in his famous memorial oration, when he says: "The great impediment to action is not discussion, but the want of that knowledge which is gained by discussion preparatory to action."

The statement in the *Public Ledger* cited above is, of course, erroneous and misleading from beginning to end. Neither the General Assembly nor the General Synod acted favorably on the Plan of Union or "the merger." Both these judicatories did act favorably on the Concurrent Declarations which affirm that "the Reformed Church in the United States and the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America represent the same type of evangelical Protestant Christianity, commonly known as Reformed or Calvinistic." While differences in the Confessions and the Catechisms are recognized, they are notwithstanding held to be in "essential agreement" and "different expressions of one and the same system of doctrine." Again, the two judicatories resolved, according to the recommendations of the Joint Committee in the Concurrent Declarations, that the whole report of the Committee, including a statement in reference to the Name of the United Church and the Plan of Union, be referred "to the Presbyteries, Classes, and Congregations, to confer in the spirit of comity with reference to the proposed union and to coöperate with one another during the coming triennium whenever practicable with a view to taking definite action for organic union in the Supreme Judicatories of the two Churches in 1914."

It is clear then that the General Assembly and the General Synod ask simply for a consideration and discussion of the material offered by the Joint Committee, for the purpose of finding out the feeling of the constituents of the two churches on the question of closer union. More than that the General Synod does not enjoin upon its subordinate judicatories or its officers and members. Every one, accordingly, is free to express his views without contravening General Synod's action; and nothing but a free, unbiased, and irenical discussion, from every point of view, will fulfill the resolutions of the Synod or the purpose of the Joint Committee. "Presbyteries and Classes and Congregations are to confer in the spirit of comity." The Standard Dictionary defines "comity" as "courtesy in private or public life; kindly consideration for others; friendliness in regard to rights."

A word now in regard to the nature of the report submitted by the Joint Committee. At its first meeting, December 4, 1908, in the Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, it was conceded by all the members present that the sentiment for closer union between the two bodies was not sufficiently deep-rooted and widespread to warrant immediate and final action. Indeed, some of the members on both sides were of the opinion that we had about as much union in the form of alliance and federation as we could reasonably hope for at present. They were inclined to discontinue further negotiations. Others, however, felt that, since the two committees were duly authorized and assembled to discuss and devise plans of closer union, two things should be tried. First, the preparation of a tentative plan of union; second, the cultivation of a spirit of union in the two churches by written and oral discussions. The latter view prevailed, and the General Committee appointed a subcommittee of six, three from each of the two committees, for further consideration and action.

In the first meeting of the subcommittee it was unanimously agreed "*that no plan for closer relation between the two churches was to be considered and urged for adoption which was not accepted with practical unanimity by both Commu-*

ions." This resolution implies that, unless the sentiment, expressed by the Synods, Presbyteries, Classes, and Congregations of the respective churches during the coming triennium, is clearly and preponderatingly in favor of closer union, the Joint Committee will cease further negotiations.

It was further resolved by the subcommittee that, as a means of introducing the two churches to each other and of cultivating acquaintanceship and an intelligent union sentiment, three papers should be prepared by members of the subcommittee and, with the consent of the General Judicatories, be printed and distributed under the direction of the Boards of Publication of the respective churches. The subjects of the papers are as follows: First, "An Historical Statement as to the Relations of the Presbyterian and the Reformed Church;" second, "The Present Status of the Reformed Church in the United States, Doctrine, Cultus, Polity, and Usages;" third, "A similar statement for the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America."

After a number of meetings, a tentative plan of union was worked out with much labor and care, and finally submitted to the Joint Committee for adoption. At that meeting, however, it turned out that the *name* for the United Church was a stumbling block. Should it be called the "Reformed Church in America," or the "Presbyterian Church in America," the "Presbyterian and Reformed Church," or the "Reformed Presbyterian Church," or the "Presbyterian (Reformed) Church?" The reader will at once recognize that none of these names is satisfactory. The members of the Reformed Committee were too modest to ask the Presbyterians to relinquish their time-honored name, and to accept the historical name of "Reformed"; and the members of the Presbyterian Committee were too generous to ask the Reformed to yield their name and to accept the name "Presbyterian." Each one felt, however, that with the surrender of the name went also the thing for which the name stands; and to give up the name was practically to give up the church which one represents. But the question not only involves denominational

honor but also serious legal difficulties. A change of name may invalidate enormous amounts of vested funds, and it will, under any circumstances, require action in the legislatures of the several states. Instead, however, of discontinuing further transactions because of this apparently insuperable difficulty, the Committee decided to make a frank statement to both churches in reference to the name of the proposed United Church. It was thought that, perhaps, if in other respects the churches desired closer union, the matter of a name might be amicably adjusted. It would clearly have been unwise for the Committee to attempt to solve legal difficulties in advance, as some one suggested on the floor of Synod, before the churches had given reasonable assurance of the desirability of union.

These facts account for the Committee's action as embodied in part two of the Report, entitled, "The Name of the United Church." It was not framed in the spirit of evasion or of compromise, but with the view of showing all concerned the difficulty of the problem. If neither church is willing to make a concession in regard to the name, then again further negotiations will prove futile. If some diplomatic genius will invent an appropriate title, which will meet the approval of both churches, he will render a notable service, and the Committee will gladly receive the suggestion.

The "Basis of Union" evidently has been carefully analyzed, since the publication of the Report, and also adversely criticized, at least in the Reformed Church. The absence of reference to the whole question in the Presbyterian Church papers indicates that the report was not discussed in the late sessions of Presbyterian Synods. In the General Assembly last spring it was passed without a word of discussion, with an ease born of the consciousness that the Presbyterian Church has little at stake. It is argued by some that the doctrinal standards of the two churches are not in essential agreement. The action of the late meeting of the Potomac Synod on this point says: "We do not agree with the 'Concurrent Declarations' especially that part which affirms that the Westminster Confession of Faith and the Heidelberg Catechism are in

'essential agreement' or sufficiently harmonious to be made the joint basis for a United Church."

A statement like this from so influential a body as the Potomac Synod requires careful consideration. The fact that a feeling of difference between the symbols of the two bodies exists, is, to say the least, significant, and is not without cause. In comparing the Confessions and Catechisms one must not only consider them as they were interpreted in the time of their composition by their authors and their contemporaries. But the difference of theological development in both churches, since their establishment in the United States, will also have to be taken into account. For, after all, it is not the Confessions in the abstract alone that ought to have weight, but the theological interpretation which they receive at the present time. No one, who knows the history of the two denominations in this country and their present theological status, will deny that there have been serious differences in the past, and it may be questioned whether they have been overcome in the present. These differences have arisen, not through hostility and opposition, but are traceable to national heritage, to the peculiar character of theological controversies, and to the genius of the leaders of the two denominations in the last two centuries. This fact undoubtedly is one reason, at least, why a synod and many thoughtful individuals in both churches, hesitate to declare an essential unity of doctrine. They feel that such a declaration can be made only with questionable evasion, equivocation, and compromise. Far more important than even church union is sincerity, loyalty to conviction, and honesty of profession. Whether Christianity is primarily doctrine, as some think, or life as others think, in either case a virtual agreement in theological interpretation of the standards is an indispensable necessity for a union in sincerity and truth.

To illustrate the difference which has manifested itself in this regard between the Presbyterian and the Reformed Church in the United States in the past, I shall quote two abstracts from the leaders of our church in the last generation. In a sermon before the alumni of the Mercersburg Theological Sem-

inary, delivered at Reading in 1856, Dr. J. H. A. Bomberger said: "Let us have it fairly understood, therefore, that it is not to Saybrook-platform Protestantism that we have plighted our faith and service, nor to the Protestantism of Hartford, Princeton, or New Brunswick, but to that form of it which is distinctly laid down in the standards already alluded to, and which may be easily ascertained by every candid inquirer. . . . As a church, therefore, or as an integral portion of the Evangelical Church we have not only a right to maintain our distinctive character, but we are placed by Providence under special obligations to do so. We are not German Presbyterians, as we are sometimes called. There would be far more propriety in the Presbyterian Church calling itself English Reformed. The title Presbyterian relates to a comparatively unimportant characteristic of the true Church. But we are German Reformed. The strong tendency of the more earnest theology of all the evangelical churches is towards those principles on which the German Reformed Church was originally founded, and for which she has from the first contended. This is the case, with reference to what are usually styled the five distinctive points of Calvinism. The preaching of our day savors far less of the Institutes of Calvin, of the Canons of Dort, or of the Westminster Confession, in reference to these points, than the mild, conciliatory, declarations of the Heidelberg Catechism. And so the Sacraments."

These words are quoted with approval in an article in the *Mercersburg Review*, July, 1872, by Dr. Thomas G. Apple, who adds:

"These Puritan and Presbyterian Confessions, including the Canons of Dort, are certainly a one-sided expression of the old Reformed faith, as expressed in so rich and catholic a spirit in the Heidelberg Catechism."

"The subject which we have considered, may serve to throw light on our relation to the Calvinistic churches around us. We have much in common with the Presbyterian and the Dutch Reformed Church. But it is clear that our own doctrinal position is more comprehensive than theirs, and better

adapted to form a basis of union for the branches of the Reformed Church than theirs. Especially is there much in the history of both denominations to bind us to the Dutch Reformed Church. But we would consider it a great calamity, if we should think for a moment of giving up our broad, catholic position, for one that would give a one-sided expression of the old Reformed faith and life. Nothing would be gained, but much lost, by yielding to a temptation to gain some outward advantage, while at the same time we should surrender any of our internal strength of position."

In the face of such deep-rooted convictions so vigorously expressed, we may well ask whether the theological positions of the sons of these fathers have changed to such an extent, in the course of thirty years, that the men of the Reformed Church may now ignore all past differences, and, without even pausing for a thorough investigation, hasten to join a united general assembly.

Can church union be effected on the basis of sixteenth and seventeenth century confessions? And even if it were brought about by synodical action, would there be any gain for the constituent denominations concerned, or any real advance in the inner life of the Kingdom? Have we not made progress in theological comprehension of the truth as it is in Christ Jesus these three centuries? Has not the Christian consciousness been enriched by the prayers, the labors, and the sacrifices of the descendants of the men of Heidelberg and of Westminster? Is there not an almost universal unrest among the ministry and laity of the Reformed and Presbyterian Churches because the old formulas no longer fit the new faith? Principal J. Oswald Dykes, Chairman of the Sub-Committee of the Eastern Section of the Alliance of Reformed Churches, on the present relation of British Churches to the Westminster Confession of Faith, Liverpool, 1904, says: "Since 1877, nearly if not quite every Church in this Alliance which accepts the Westminster Standards has been endeavoring in one way or another, to adjust its relations to those doctrines. The avowed aim has in every instance been to remove hindrances out of the way of



orthodox members accepting office by making it easier for them to profess adhesion to the existing Standards. It has been found that men who are intelligent and loyal as to the substance of the faith to confessional teaching, find it increasingly difficult to express their faith in the precise terms of the Westminster formularies, or to give an *ex animo* assent in their details to long and archaic documents which carry in every article the pressure and the colour of a period of English history which lies far behind us and was very unlike our own."

I have been told, also, by one who is a reliable authority in the Presbyterian Church, that letters are received almost weekly from intelligent men inquiring about the authority and the meaning of certain articles of the Confession of Faith. A simpler and more comprehensible formula is asked for. Is not the Reformed Church ready to accede to such requests, and to prepare a brief Confession for the use of officials and members, as well as for a basis of union with the Presbyterian Church and even with other churches? May we not now, as members in committee have done, urge the Presbyterian Church to meet us in such a proposition; and, until they are prepared to do that, ought we not to labor peacefully side by side in alliance and in federal union, upon which relations we have already entered, and are now coöperating in the upbuilding of the Kingdom of God in America and in the Orient? Whenever the time is ripe for such a consensus statement, in which the essence of the old is conserved and the substance of the new is incorporated, then has the hour come for a union "which will be just and fair to both sides and will conserve the genius and spirit of both churches."

There are men in the Reformed Church, tried and true, who believe that there is no essential doctrinal difference between the standards of the two denominations; or, even if there is, that it may well be overlooked in the interest of the practical advantages of a united church. All these benefits, however, can be obtained through the Council of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System, or the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. The mis-

sionary territory in this country and abroad is being distributed among the churches so as to avert overlapping. Weak congregations in missionary fields of different denominations may be honorably merged by the Missionary Boards represented in the Council of Reformed Churches. Reformed and Presbyterian publications can readily be brought to the attention of all bodies in the Council through the Boards of Publication, and coöperation in moral and social reform, in a systematic and authoritative way, may now be obtained both through the Council of Reformed Churches and the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ. All this can be accomplished without sacrificing denominational identity. May it not be well at this point to emphasize, also, that the churches are at present lured unduly by the snare of the economic and the practical to the neglect of the deeply intellectual and spiritual—those very things for which the Fathers and the Reformers became martyrs? We are in danger of a vague, colorless, and flabby theological latitudinarianism which is equally content with nothing or with everything. There is a sectarian bigotry which must be denounced in unmeasured terms. There is, also, a denominational loyalty, the decline of which will be a serious handicap to a vigorous pursuit of the work of Christ's Kingdom. The last sentence of the quotation from Dr. Apple's article, than whom there was no more ardent advocate of church union in America, keeps ringing in one's ears: "Nothing would be gained but much lost, by yielding to a temptation to gain some outward advantage while at the same time we should surrender any of our internal position."

Let us now consider the kind of union which is proposed in the Plan submitted by the Joint Committee. It has been interpreted in various ways by different men. Many do not profess to be in the clear as to its meaning. Some term it a form of organic union with federal modifications; others call it without hesitation a merger, or a submerger, or at best a sort of benevolent absorption. All seem to agree that, if the union involves the loss of our denominational existence, we are not prepared for the present to consummate it.

The Plan, which is now before us, is of course only tentative and subject to modification before its presentation for final action. Yet I am convinced, as a member of the subcommittee which prepared it after long deliberation and discussion, that it embodies about all that the Presbyterians can honorably grant and the Reformed can respectfully ask. In substance, then, the tentative plan may be regarded as the one which will be offered for final adoption, providing the Joint Committee feels warranted to continue further negotiations.

What is the Reformed Church required to give up? First, it gives up its constitution and form of discipline. Second, it dissolves its General Synod, though for the present the subordinate judicatories remain intact. Third, it surrenders the permanency even of its Synods, Classes, and Congregations, for it opens the way for these bodies to be united with corresponding bodies in the Presbyterian Church by the United General Assembly. The same privilege is allowed the Judicatories of the Presbyterian Church. But that it will ever be exercised by the judicatories of the larger body is palpably improbable. Fourth, it abolishes, though the process may be gradual, all the Boards which are under the control of the General Synod, such as the Missionary Boards, the Sunday-school Boards, etc. In a word, the Reformed Church gives up its denominational existence; and an unprejudiced observer from the outside would regard it as a part of the Presbyterian Church.

What does the Presbyterian Church give up? It is easier to answer this question by asking a second—What does the Presbyterian Church retain? First, it keeps the Form of Government and Book of Discipline. Second, it retains the General Assembly, only in an enlarged form. Third, it preserves the Boards of the General Assembly with one or two additional members. Fourth, how much of a modification in the name it will allow remains to be seen. In short the Presbyterian Church gives up nothing, and in an enlarged form keeps everything it now has.

If it gives up nothing, it does, however, grant the Reformed

Church certain privileges. It permits the General Synod to end its existence and to join the General Assembly. It allows the Classes to send their delegates to the United General Assembly. The historian will cease to write the history of the General Synod and will mark the beginning of the end of the history of the Reformed Church on the day that the United General Assembly opens. He will write, however, a new chapter in the history of the General Assembly enlarged by the addition of sixty Classes, or Presbyteries, formerly known as Reformed. It permits the addition of one or two men on the boards of the Church. It allows, also, that Reformed Synods and Classes may join similar bodies in the Presbyterian Church. It agrees that the Heidelberg Catechism be considered the equivalent of the Westminster Standards, and that the Reformed congregations may continue their present mode of worship. In granting these privileges the Presbyterian Church neither surrenders nor sacrifices an iota of doctrine, polity, or worship. But in the acceptance of them, the Reformed Church surrenders its denominational existence and the autonomy which it enjoyed since the organization of the first synod in 1793. This is more than sacrifice; it approaches suicide. Far be it from us to cast a reproach on the Presbyterian Church or its Committee on Church Coöperation and Union, for the consequences of the proposed union. They are unavoidable and beyond the control of a committee or a church. Yet if that is the case, the Reformed Church has the right, if the convictions of her members disapprove it, to stand aloof from a union of this sort, without being chargeable with repudiating the Zwinglian hand or denying the authority of the prayer of our Lord (John 17: 21).

A comparative study of the ratio of representation of the two churches in the United General Assembly will also serve to show the effect of the union on the Reformed Church. According to the Constitution of the Reformed Church, the ratio of representation of a classis in the General Synod, is one minister and one elder for every ten ministers or fraction thereof. According to the Form of Government of the Presby-

terian Church the ratio of representation of presbyteries is one minister and one elder for every twenty-four ministers and "for each additional fractional number of ministers not less than twelve." The roll of delegates of the last General Synod contains the names of one hundred and fifty ministers and one hundred and fifty elders; that of the General Assembly of the previous year, four hundred and thirty-six ministers and four hundred and thirty-six elders. In the United General Assembly, according to the ratio of representation of the Form of Government, the Reformed Classes would have sixty-six ministers and sixty-six elders, and the Presbyteries, four hundred and thirty-six ministers and four hundred and thirty-six elders; or one Reformed minister to every seven Presbyterian ministers. It does not take a prophet's eye to foresee the part which the Reformed Church would play in the United Assembly. But even now the General Assembly is considered so large that it has become an unwieldy body. The question of reducing the ratio of representation has been seriously discussed; and if the reduction should be effected, which would be altogether reasonable, the proportion of Reformed representation would be reduced to an uninfluential minimum.

It may be argued, however, that for the present the Synods, Classes, and Congregations remain unchanged. But when the General Synod, the natural head of these subordinate judicatories is gone, who will not realize that denominational identity and independence are practically gone also? Headless as the Reformed Church then would be, it would be like the Church in Sardis of which it was said, "Thou hast a name that thou livest, and thou art dead." The supreme judicatory of a church plans the practical work of Synods, Classes and Congregations for each year. It controls, through its boards, the missionary operations, Sunday-school work, and other forms of benevolence, and is the court of last resort in all cases of appeal. If the General Synod of the Reformed Church is dissolved and united with the General Assembly, then the occupation of our Synods, Classes, and Consistories clearly is reduced to an acceptance of the action of the United Assembly,

in which the Reformed representation is so small that it becomes practically insignificant. True, these judicatories still have the right of protest; a right, however, which they ought to be slow to use, and which, even if exercised, in the nature of the case could have little weight.

In the light of these facts it is not hard to answer the question, What will be the effect on the Reformed Church if the Plan of Union is adopted? It matters little what the Joint Committee may desire it to be. And here let it be clearly understood that not a member of the Presbyterian Committee, any more than of the Reformed Committee, seeks a union that would be unfair, disadvantageous, or dishonorable to the Reformed Church. Insinuations contained in current expressions, such as "they will take us in," or "they will swallow us up," or "they will let us come in," have no ground so far as the members of the Committees are concerned. Yet, by virtue of their numerical strength, their prestige, and the continuation of the Form of Government and Book of Discipline unchanged, the Presbyterian Church with its 1,339,000 communicants, could not help but absorb the 296,160 communicants of the Reformed Church. The smaller denomination would necessarily have to become Presbyterian. The character of a union of bodies of such unequal size can not be determined by the plan of a committee, or resolutions of synods. It would be controlled by a law higher than ecclesiastical constitutions; namely the law of organic life, by which the larger organism absorbs and assimilates the smaller. The smaller is merged in the larger. It matters little whether the merging is immediate or gradual; so far as the Reformed Church is concerned, it could not honorably accept a plan which would even ultimately work such a result. If in the words of Dr. Bomberger, spoken a generation ago, "We are not German Presbyterians," then surely at this stage of our history we can not become English Presbyterians.

Some one will say, if you favor church union as you profess to do, and yet are opposed to the union now under consideration, what sort of union do you want? I answer, there are

different kinds of unions; and the kind which I strive for, I should term a *truly organic* union. Permit me to define it. When two churches of the same type, or of different types, have both advanced to a higher plane of Christian life and thought, by virtue of deep spiritual experiences usually under the leadership of an epoch-making personality, which have brought them into closer fellowship with the Christ and have deepened and widened their Christian consciousness to such an extent that the new life can no longer be contained in the old forms, and that the two bodies by spontaneous spiritual attractions are brought into one; then we shall have union without evasion, compromise, annihilation, or a one-sided sacrifice of the smaller body. Then both churches will become something different from what they were, without losing the essential truth for which they stood; they will rather conserve the old, and combine it with the new, truth that is continually breaking forth from God's Word and welling up in the hearts of His people. Out of the two there will come a new organism with a new life and a new name. A union on any other basis is doomed to be a mere coalition, a merger, and a forensic transaction without spiritual value. Such a union may be a "far off divine event," but, we believe, that toward it "the whole creation moves." It can not be made by might nor by power; it must come by the spirit of God in the churches.

The efforts for union, which are now made on two continents, are not wrong, undesirable, or fruitless; they are the unmistakable evidence of the activity of the glorified Christ in his church. As there were reformers before the Reformation, so there will be unionists before the Union. In a great movement like this, there always are pioneers who blaze paths; voices in the desert preparing the way for what we are now blindly groping, praying, and working. In the meantime we ought to possess our souls in patience, to coöperate in alliances and federal councils, and to abide in faith the fullness of the time for a union which will conserve diversity in unity and unity in diversity.

There is not a church in American Protestantism that has a



juster claim than has the Reformed Church in the United States for the continuance of its denominational existence. It is not a sect nor a schism which has sprung up on American soil or even in a European land. It traces its origin to the very springs of Protestant Christianity in the sixteenth century. It has distinctive racial, temperamental, and doctrinal characteristics; all of which are so subtle and yet so real that they can hardly be defined in words. They are, nevertheless, so closely interwoven with the life of the Reformed ministers and people, both as a heritage and as an attainment by training in family, school and congregation, that they mold thought and life, word and deed. For us the Kingdom of God becomes historical and concrete, vital and personal, in the unique spirit and form of our denominational life. The church of our inheritance or of our adoption can be relinquished for another only when we have changed our deepest religious convictions, or when, through circumstances, we are compelled to adjust ourselves to the genius and forms of another denomination. It is one thing for an individual here and there, now and then, to change his denominational affiliations. It is an altogether different thing for a group of individuals to give up their denominational existence; for with it goes a part, not only of their own spiritual and ethical life but of that of their fathers for centuries before them.

Surely such a sacrifice is required or such a surrender should be made only under conditions which in the progress of the race are exceedingly unfrequent, and arise under the most extraordinary circumstances. When they do come, however, the call is so clear and the motive so powerful that instead of using argument and persuasion to consummate the change, its consummation could not be hindered by the most convincing logic or by the most powerful armies. Who could have prevented the Reformation when the hour of Protestantism struck? Who can hinder the higher union of churches when the historical time for union has come?

That the Reformed Church has a mission and a message for a union larger than the one now proposed, is powerfully set

forth in a sermon by Dr. Briggs, who will be regarded as an impartial and unprejudiced observer, when he says, "The German Reformed have the distinguished honor in this country of remaining undivided. There have been controversies among their churches, of much greater importance than those which rent asunder the Dutch Reformed and the British Presbyterians, but the German Reformed have ever remained true to the genuine type of the Heidelberg Catechism. The German Reformed Church has retained the comprehensive character of the original Reformed theology, rather than the distinctive Calvinistic peculiarities of that type. She has the graceful form and well-rounded proportions of a blooming daughter of the Reformation. One does not see in her as in so many Reformed Churches the sharp visage and the angular proportions of a venerable dame who has spent her days and wasted her strength in fruitless contention with her own flesh and blood. Wherefore the German Reformed occupy the best position in our country to mediate between the different churches of the Reformation and to take the lead in the Reunion movement."

LANCASTER, PA.

## VI.

### WHAT CHRIST BROUGHT TO THE SCHOOLROOM.

A. THOS. G. APPLE.

"Thou art a Teacher sent from God." Nicodemus, addressing Jesus of Nazareth in these words, voices the conviction of his associates, who were the religious teachers of a people that has been universally recognized as the religious teacher of humanity.

"The multitudes were astonished at his teaching: for He taught them as one having authority, and not as their scribes." So Matthew describes the artless impression of the people that in growing numbers followed Jesus from place to place.

These two judgments—of the people, and of their leaders—voice the conviction of the whole world through all the centuries. Whatever else is to be said of Jesus' person and work as the Saviour of the world, it is true that He was the greatest teacher the world ever has seen. The function of Saviour included that of Teacher. And in the mighty transformation of every one of the interests of human life wrought by His person and life, the science and practice of teaching has received its own large share.

To realize this let us seek for the reasons for that marvellous attraction that brought men of all stations to sit at His feet, and also for the causes of this transformation that is the central phenomenon of all history.

The secret of Jesus' power as a teacher is that which gave Him His power over men in all other things, namely His unconquerable, self-sacrificing love. We may speak of a teacher's theory or his philosophy; we may speak of a teacher's methods of instruction; we may take account of the substance of his teaching; yet all must give way in importance to that which is

the formative principle of his life—that which *drives* him to be a teacher. And so we need to consider the love of Jesus for humanity as it operated to make Him the Teacher of all teachers.

From His love resulted His interest, His knowledge, His sympathy. No human interest so remote but it attracted Him. He was above all things a man of the world in the best sense of the term. Where the streams of life flowed in fullest power, there He was ever to be found. The only thing that forced Him out of the cities into the country was the very denseness of the crowds that thronged Him, as well as His need of the pure breath of communion with His heavenly Father. "He eats and drinks with sinners," "He associates with publicans and others of the lowest classes," "He is a wine-bibber and a glutton," are the accusations of His enemies, and in them they unconsciously testify to His incomprehensible interest in humanity, an interest that refused to recognize any class distinctions, and which considered the most precious things of *life's advantages to be the sacred right of all.*

His knowledge of humanity recognized its weakness as well as its strength. Man's ignorance, his sin, his need, by the intensity of its appeal drew Him down to the depths of the lowest misery; yet at the same time it kept Him upon the heights, where, independent of any entangling alliances with the forces of humanity about Him, He would be the more free to extend the helping hand wherever help was needed. "He knew what was in man," both of good and of bad, and with abiding faith in the essential character of the good to be found in even the worst, He devoted Himself to the work of bringing each one to recognize the seed of goodness in his own soul, and to respect himself and his fellow man because of it. And it is in the light of this recognized goodness and the glow of reverence for it as a gift of God that we find the secret of the influence which Jesus could wield over every man and woman with whom He came in contact. For His enduring faith in human nature saw that to bring the soul to recognize its original birth-

right was the only influence that would lead eventually to the purification of the desires, the emancipation of the reason, and the final enthronement of the will.

In the sensitiveness of His sympathy for essential humanity we see involved the whole secret of His marvellous ability to deal with men and women of every station, as they came to Him singly or in crowds. His effort is always directed towards bringing them to know themselves and to realize their relations to others in the world in which they are placed. This world was not, in His view, an environment indifferent or hostile to them, but a world of spiritual forces manifested in outward forms—an organic whole of which man was a living member. And therefore the end He sought was to put these spiritual forces into the hand of each one, and then encourage him to use them as the instrument by which he can rise to the enjoyment of true freedom.

The world of nature and the world of humanity are therefore a symbol—a series of symbols—of the truth which He would teach. They are this not because of some outward mechanical resemblance, but because of an inward essential unity. The fatherhood of God, for instance, which is the unifying conception of all the parables, is not merely a something presenting striking points of resemblance to human fatherhood; it is a relation essentially the same. The seed is the Word, not because of a series of analogies seized by the imagination, but because of an inward correspondence existing in the ultimate unity of all life, both spiritual and natural. Sometimes the relation may not be so close or vital: the unjust judge or the faithless steward are little more than analogies. Yet even here Jesus recognized the unity of ethical relations; and it was His hearers' instinctive sense of the reality of these relations that made the appeal of His parables so strong.

In the prevaillingly parabolic form of His preaching we see in Jesus the instinct and the method of the true teacher. He is leading His school from the known to the unknown. The unknown is a true selfconsciousness, the known is the whole world

of nature and humanity; and the known becomes the vehicle of the unknown because of the inward organic relation of the two. No interest therefore, in heaven or in earth or in hades, but is laid under tribute to furnish Him material for illustration. It is the winds blowing where they list; the seed growing and fruiting freely in the good soil, or choked among thorns or smothered by stones; song birds in the tree tops; lilies blooming in the field; flocks of docile sheep wending their homeward way. The relations of man with man open up another world of familiar images; the judge and the culprit; master and servant; merchant and buyer; children at play; family life; parents and children.

Nor is it in Jesus' discernment alone of this wealth of material that we see the instinct of the teacher; but still more clearly is it shown in the loving tact by which He gains for the truth an entrance into the heart. At one time it is a "Ruler in Israel" who is given a reminder as courteous as it is insistent, that he as a teacher ought to understand the substance of what he teaches. At another time it is an outcast woman, and she has pointed out to her the irregularity of her life with five paramours, with such consideration that it leads to her enlightenment and conversion. And if the case of the rich young ruler is in doubt as to its final outcome, it is at all events apparent that the treatment accomplished its purpose in causing the young man of himself to find himself, and to have been brought by his own reflection face to face with the truth; so that thenceforth it remained with himself to choose whether or not to act accordingly. And this after all is the limit to all teaching.

The one great truth, in fine, which Jesus would lead His hearers to discover is the supreme dignity and worth of human nature, and the priceless value of the individual. "You are a king," He would say to every publican and sinner; and He would bring the truth home by causing the publican to discover the truth himself. The apostle John has preserved for us a few of these talks of Jesus. Sometimes it is with individuals, as with Nicodemus or the Samaritan woman; or with

a multitude, as the people in the synagog of Capernaum when He spoke about the bread of life. In all these, as we follow the thought from point to point, led by gradual but sure steps to the final conclusion, we are forcibly reminded of some of the conversations of that other educator with whom Jesus has been compared, Socrates.

The very term "Kingdom of God," which embraces so much of the real message of Jesus to the world, is itself the embodiment of this same conception of the worth of humanity. For what is meant by the kingdom of God if it is not humanity itself; humanity, redeemed, spontaneously obedient, instinct throughout with love to God and love to man; humanity with all its capacities and powers dedicated to the service of Him who is its King? This is, at least from one point of view, the great lesson the Teacher of men came to teach. And so firmly was He convinced of its reality, and so filled with enthusiasm as to the possibility of its realization, that He let His countrymen nail Him to the cross rather than prove false to the blessed ideal.

We have just now mentioned the comparison of Socrates and Jesus as the two great teachers. In many ways the comparison is true; in many ways the spirit and method of the two are strikingly similar. But there is a deep-lying contrast, that becomes stronger and clearer the further we go until we are more impressed with the differences than with the resemblances.

Socrates represents the best development of Greek teaching, and therefore of world culture—for the schoolroom of the world was at Athens; and Greek culture was the final effort of humanity in the evolutionary process when Jesus came; and this attempt which culminated in the Academy of Plato and the Lyceum of Aristotle was by this time beginning to exhaust its vitality. It will therefore be interesting to compare the greatest teacher of the ancient time with the greatest Teacher of all time. Let us make the comparison.

A good picture of the genius and method of Socrates occurs



in a little dialog between him and the Thirty Tyrants, by whom the philosopher had been virtually forbidden to teach. Athens had become "corrupt and contented," and Socrates one day had quietly let drop a remark that had so laid bare the methods and animus of "the gang" that, though it barely touched the sensory nerve, it stung.

Thereupon Critias and Charicles, two of the Thirty, sent for Socrates, read the law to him—incidentally the "riot act"—and forbade him henceforth to hold conversations with the young. Whereat ensued the following colloquy:

"Socrates inquired of them whether he might be permitted to ask questions touching what might seem obscure to him in this prohibition. Upon permission being granted, he said:

"'I am prepared to obey the laws, but that I may not violate them through ignorance, I would have you clearly inform me whether you interdict the art of speaking because it belongs to the number of things which are good, or because it belongs to the number of things which are bad. In the first case, one ought henceforth to abstain from speaking what is good; in the second, it is clear that the effort should be to speak what is right.'

"Thereupon Charicles became angry, and said:

"'Since you do not understand us, we will give you something easier to comprehend: we forbid you absolutely to hold conversation with the young.'

"'In order that it may be clearly seen,' said Socrates, 'whether I depart from what is enjoined, tell me at what age a youth becomes a man.'

"'At the time he is eligible to the senate, for he has not acquired prudence till then; so do not speak to young men who are below the age of thirty.'

"'But if I wish to buy something of a merchant who is below the age of thirty, may I ask him at what price he sells it?'

"'Certainly you may ask such a question; but you are accustomed to raise inquiries about multitudes of things which

are perfectly well known to you; it is this which is forbidden.'

"So I must not reply to a young man who asks me where Charicles lives, or where Critias is?'

"You may reply to such questions, but recollect, Socrates, you must let alone the shoemakers and smiths and other artisans, for I think they must already be very much worn out by being so often in your mouth.'

"I must therefore,' concluded Socrates, 'forego the illustrations I draw from these occupations relative to justice, piety, and all the virtues.'"

The gleam of moral earnestness in this last remark illumines the real purpose of the philosopher throughout the colloquy and invests it with a perennial dignity.

But we have only to place this scene alongside any one of those in which Jesus was placed in similar circumstances in order to feel contrasts to be far more profound than resemblances.

In the beginning we are reminded of a very similar question asked in Galilee: "Is it lawful to do good on the Sabbath day or to do evil; to heal or to kill?"

But in spite of the moral earnestness of Socrates—and in this he stands a beacon light in his own and all other ages—the question of Jesus falls into a higher class by itself, because of that which lies back of it. Socrates seeks liberty of speech; Jesus seeks freedom to act—untrammelled power to help and to heal.

This is not an accidental contrast, but it reveals the Greek mind and heart in its passion for dialectic gymnastics, a passion that threatened, in the centuries after Christ, to lead the church far afield and which did eventually eat out the heart of the oriental portion and opened the way for the advent of Mohammedanism.

In Jesus, on the other hand, we see not so much a mind working from within the life of the people to whom he by birth belonged (and the Jewish people admittedly surpassed all others in the depth of their moral earnestness), but we see in

Jesus a genius rising in His moral and spiritual might above His people, above His age, above all ages, and becoming the example to the whole human race.

The contrast becomes deeper the farther we go. Much as we admire Socrates for the purity of his disinterestedness, the nobility of his self-sacrifice, we cannot altogether escape the impression in many of his dialogues of what in a less man we would term priggishness and vanity. At times we almost hear a little self-satisfied chuckle as he watches his shots hit their mark and sees his adversary sprawling in confusion. That little chuckle was never heard in Jerusalem or Galilee. The Socratic irony, by which name it was dignified, was a vanishing quantity in the discourses of Jesus. We believe it is there and at times it is used with tremendous power, but it becomes so infused with an all-consuming love and sympathy that it ceases to be the same thing.

While we shall never cease to admire the heroism of the Grand Old Man of Athens, true as he was till death; while he will be accorded to the end of time the unique position of the highest point to which human disinterestedness attained before the coming of Christ; while he will ever be accorded a place as the one in whom above all others the true instinct of the Teacher showed itself as an all-consuming love for youth and a fixed purpose to lead them out into the enjoyment of their heritage; yet the more we examine the circumstances of their lives and their deaths, the more the conviction is forced upon our reason that the hemlock cup can never be placed beside the Cross, and that the last cry from Calvary, "It is finished" could not without blasphemy be put into the mouth of the condemned prisoner of Athens. In a word Jesus is not so much the greatest amongst other great teachers of the world as He is the Teacher of all time; who is preëminent, not so much as a towering peak rises from amongst a range of hills, but rather as the silent stars are higher than the moonlit mountain tops.

The schoolroom has felt the presence of this Inspirer of all

Teachers chiefly, and we might say wholly in the form of inspiration. Jesus taught no science and can scarce be said to have originated any method. As to the last he merely took what was here and by his inspiration brought it to more perfect and powerful action, just as the player tunes his instrument and makes it send forth finer tones that are at the same time more strongly penetrating. It is in the divine touch of His love and sympathy, producing a like love and sympathy in the teacher's soul, that the secret of secrets can be learned. While this is being achieved—and it is a life process—the method takes care of itself.

The strange thing, however, is the slowness with which the principles brought to light by Jesus made their way in the world. Eighteen centuries must pass before they become a clearly marked, practical, transforming force in the practice of teaching. Lack of time alone prevents an entrance upon that wonderful history, and this we regret, for it is one of the most fascinating studies possible to follow this course down through the centuries—a course marked by the personality of great teachers, who in their time dominated emperors and fashioned the currents of history more than all the generals. We see the precious results of the classic civilization trampled under the hoofs of Attila's warhorse, or trailed in the dust by Alaric's barbarians. We see a new Teutonic civilization founded on the ruins of the old, and starting almost from the very beginning the arduous task that had been so well accomplished in Athens and Alexandria. We see reformers like Charlemagne and his faithful teacher Alcuin toiling on with methods no better than those long before found to be unequal to the task in Greece and Rome. We see these successes quickly quenched in war and bloodshed, while a long night settles upon Europe, and learning flees to the Arabs. We trace the rise of the schoolmen, with their endless syllogism; and while we perceive the signs of a dawning day, we hear much that is little else than the rattle of an empty mill. They are more concerned with the machinery of reasoning than with its substance, and listen

to the noise of the revolving wheels, indifferent whether the grain is ground to feed the souls of men. We feel the hope of the Renaissance; but the great awakening has partly spent its force by the time its rising waves have reached the schoolroom. And it needs a French Revolution, quick to see, though powerless to actualize the principles of the new and universal education. It needs the sufferings of a Pestalozzi and a Froebel before the modern world begins to see at last the true meaning of education, namely, the right of every one, both high and low, to the opportunity to find himself in all the wealth of God-given talents, and to have freest scope to use them.

In this evolution in which through the passing centuries the Christ-inspired teacher has been seeking, first to catch the spirit of the Great Teacher, and then to actualize it in systems and in schools, we see at work two great opposing principles. We may term them the monastic and the humanistic. In no one do we see a more complete embodiment of both these than in that man who did more than any other to fashion and inspire the monastic system which became the educational institution of the middle ages, and who at the same time underneath his uncouth and violent exterior shows a heart full of tenderest affection, of profoundest respect for woman, and most sensitive interest in all the affairs of life in general; a man in short whose personality through his vast scholarship, and his translation of the Scriptures into the common tongue—the Vulgate—dominated the world through a thousand years. I refer to Jerome.

There is a letter of his extant written to a mother in Rome, who has consulted him about the education of her daughter, that bears so directly upon our subject and illustrates so clearly what I have said that I ask your attention to a somewhat full quotation from it.

"Get for her," he writes, and we seem to be reading from a work on pedagogy from the twentieth century instead of directions from a monk sitting in his lonely cell in Bethlehem at the

close of the fourth. "Get for her a set of letters made of box-wood or of ivory and call each by its proper name. Let her play with these, so that even her play may teach her something . . ." (Froebel, fourteen centuries before his time). "Moreover, so soon as she begins to use the style upon the wax, and her hand is still faltering, either guide her soft fingers by laying your hand upon hers, or else have simple copies cut upon a tablet, so that her efforts combined within these limits may keep to the lines traced out for her and not stray outside of these. Offer prizes for good spelling and draw her onward with little gifts such as children of her age delight in" (Froebel again). "And let her have companions in her lessons to excite emulation in her, that she may be stimulated when she sees them praised. You must not scold her if she is slow to learn but must employ praise to excite her mind, so that she may be glad when she excels others, and sorry when she is excelled by them. Above all you must take care not to make her lessons distasteful to her lest a dislike for them conceived in childhood may continue into her maturer years . . ."

Has the nurture of the child anywhere been put more succinctly or with sweeter tenderness! We find it hard to realize that it comes from a man who had never been a father, and to whom the joys of wedded life were but concessions to the flesh soiled with sin.

But all this is but the unconscious cry of his human heart demanding to have recognition in the age about to begin—the age succeeding the sack of Rome—the age that is to replace the worn-out civilization of the ancient world. It is but a solitary cry that finds no answer in that age of blood and terror; and it is soon drowned out by the voices of chanting monks and the "swish" of the whip of the flagellant. There is another side to Jerome, a spirit formed and moulded we believe by the age in which he lived, but which in turn fashioned the life of the world, and cramped and repressed its generous impulses through many long centuries. There is another side to Jerome, unlovable and unloving, harsh, vain,

intolerant, vindictive. In the former spirit he could love his friend, Rufinus, with an affection which has few parallels in history; in the latter he will sacrifice that friendship without a scruple and say harshest things, long after the heat of the controversy that had divided them was past, and even after his friend should have been given the protection of the grave.

And so as he proceeds with his directions for the education of little Paula we find the ascetic more and more obscuring the man. The little girl is, of course, to be devoted to the heavenly Spouse, and at last to find her place in a convent. Therefore, of course, no young man must greet her with smiles. "If our little virgin goes to keep solemn eves and all night vigils, let her not stir a hair's breadth from her mother's side. She must not single out one of her maids to make her a special favorite or a confidante." And then follows prescriptions for a life of stern asceticism made up of frequent and prolonged vigils, fasts, reading and prayers. "Let her be deaf to the sound of the organ, and not know even the uses of the pipe, the lyre and the cithern," are the words by which he shows his disdain for the art that not only possesses the highest refining influences, but which has furthered the cause of religion itself more than any other. And thus as he proceeds we seem to see in the man himself an image of the age that is just beginning, an age that he is destined to exercise so large an influence in moulding—an age in which the human instincts were crushed, and the soul left no solace but a "religion of despair."

It is a far cry from Jerome to Pestalozzi—from the fourth to the eighteenth century. But the Christ spirit which appears with such tender interest and affection in the earlier regime of Paula, and which it must be said appears again and again in all Jerome's writings—this Christ spirit never disappeared from the world; but found its exponents in a glorious company of apostles, and martyrs too, standing and fighting and suffering for the Christian principle of education: the supreme worth of humanity, the universal right shared by even the humblest for



the chance to know its powers and to exercise them with fullest freedom for its own well-being and the well-being of others.

As a champion of this spirit stood the liberal Charlemagne and his faithful commissioner of education, Alcuin; also Alfred of England who said, "Englishmen ought always to be free, as free as their own thoughts," and "Freeborn sons should know how to read and write." We see among the cloud of witnesses such contrasted temperaments as Luther and Erasmus, Calvin and Tyndall, Zwingli and Herbert Spencer. We find such men as the brilliant Fenelon, educator of a headstrong prince, and by his success the saviour of his people from nameless miseries. We see La Chalotais, the teacher and the philosopher, teaching by scientific experiments, Bacon and the simple-hearted Comenius, teaching by pictures. The philosopher Descartes, Diderot the brilliant encyclopedist, and Roland the practical instructor, each from his own point of view, pleads for the universal right of education. Even LaSalle, who scarcely rises above the severely ascetic temper of his surroundings, contributes to the advance toward humanity by substituting the minutely regulated use of the rod, the ferule, and various penances for the unbridled license of personal abuse in the schoolroom, while at the same time he makes his most enduring contribution in the establishment of industrial schools, and with sublime heroism dedicates himself and his fortune that the poor may have gratuitous education. Kant, by the moral earnestness of his philosophy gives added dignity to the work of teaching, and places it in the true light by that thought which embodies the whole idea of the Incarnation; namely, that all culture is the result of the vital union of the superior coming down and allying itself with the inferior for the purpose of raising it up. Woman emerges from her obscurity in the convent or the home and adds her share; and Jacqueline Pascal, Madame de Maintenon and others contribute by their life-work to lead the world a few steps onward by granting to their own sex the rights to real culture to which their humanity entitles them. Even fiction contributes its

share; and creatures of the imagination, ideals, often Utopian, of a perfectly educated man—Gargantua from the brain of Rabelais, Rousseau's Emile, Leonard and Gertrude from the heart of Pestalozzi—these move like ghosts through the halls of learning, luring the educator on to better things.

Finally the French Revolution bursts upon the world. But those who exploded the blast, blinded, bruised and suffocated, were unable to utilize the treasure laid bare. It remained for others after the smoke had cleared away to gather it for the enrichment of the world. The French Revolution, so far as concerns its bearing upon the development of education, is remarkable for the great number of plans and theories (many of them most excellent) for universal education, and at the same time for its utter impotency to carry them into execution. Bill follows bill from the successive legislative bodies as they rise and fall—no one of them without its educational measure. But the convention that gives it birth dies before the measure attains to practical life, and the cause of education is made worse than ever. It remained for the strong hand of the Dictator, the First Consul, to found the University of France, and about the same time in far off Switzerland the man arose who more than any other has not only embodied in himself the desire of the centuries, but also carried it out in the spirit of Christ.

Pestalozzi, as we have said, represents the last and in many respects the greatest in the long struggle of humanity against the smothering spirit of asceticism. There is time for only the briefest view of this most remarkable genius. No one perhaps in all history embodied a stranger bundle of contradictions. There is no one whose projects and endeavors show so many failures, and at the same time whose very failures have afterwards become the inspiration of vaster or more promising successes. Uncouth, and entirely careless of his personal appearance, he repels the stranger and is unable to allay the prejudices of the community, yet within is a love for men,

and children in particular, that wins the hearts of the ragged and riotous little vagrants and compels from them a devotion that is almost worship for their new-found father. He is counted an ignoramus, and in many points his education is defective, while he is entirely without a philosophy; yet he is sought out by the philosopher Fichte as a particular friend from whose efforts he anticipates the regeneration of the schools of Germany. With the innocence of a child he is never able to size up the significance of the passing situation, yet with the constancy of a martyr he never loses sight of the ideal of his life which is to lead each child to a consciousness of its own dignity, and to impart to it its right to free and untrammelled progress. His schools appeared to the superficial visitor a Bedlam of confusion, yet from them went forth men who everywhere became leaders in the educational regeneration of their land; and his pupils were recognized everywhere by their capacity for work and the rapidity of their progress. He was entirely devoid of administrative ability, yet his Institute at Yverdun is the resort of pupils from all nations. And though its existence stretched over scarcely twenty years, there proceeded from it an inspiration felt throughout Europe and which still moves the world.

If we search for the reason for all this—the unifying principle of all these strange contradictions which brought out of them their significant successes,—we must find in it the full degree in which Pestalozzi possessed the mind of the Master. It was the degree to which he manifested that sweetness of mind which in Jerome was so soon overwhelmed by his dour asceticism, but which in Pestalozzi continued strong to the end.

He is the incarnation of Kant's ideal, viz., the favored one partaking of the estate of the unfortunate ones and making it his own in order to deliver them from their miseries. Nowhere is this seen more strikingly than in his treatment of the vermin-infested, ragged orphans he gathered in the Home in Stanz. He was with them all the day and put them to bed at night.

He would have no assistants for no assistant could be found capable of his supreme sacrifice.

"We wept and smiled together," he says of these days. "We shared our food and drink. I had neither family, friends, nor servants; nothing but them. I was with them in sickness and health, and when they slept. I was the last to go to bed and the first to get up. In the bed-room I played with them, and at their own request taught them till they fell asleep."

As a result they became so devotedly attached to him that he comes to take the place of parent in their affections. They are caught with the contagion of his devotion, so that when the town of Altdorf is burned they vote to receive a number of the homeless ones, knowing full well that their own allowances will be lessened thereby. And of another school it was said, "It is a practical school of sacrifice and renunciation." This whelming of self in his work is one of the most characteristic traits of Pestalozzi to the end.

In the next place we perceive an abiding confidence in human nature that will not give up no matter what the discouragements. At a time when his children at Stanz embraced the most ignorant and ungrateful lot that could be imagined, he writes with a remarkable hope:

"This complete ignorance was what troubled me least, for I trusted in the natural powers that God bestows on even the poorest and most neglected children. I had observed for a long time that beneath their coarseness, shyness and apparent incapacity, are hidden the finest faculties, the most precious powers."

The educational theory by which he would awaken and draw out these faculties and powers is no less the mind and method of the Master. Epigrammatic expressions abound on all sides in his writings:

"All the pure and beneficent powers of humanity are neither the products of art nor the results of chance. They are

really a natural possession of every man. Their development is a universal need."

"Man! in thyself, in the inward consciousness of thine own strength, is the instrument intended by nature for thy development."

"The path of nature, which develops the powers of humanity, must be easy and open to all; education which brings true wisdom and peace of mind must be simple and within everybody's reach."

The spirit at Stanz traces its origin back to the Mount of Beatitudes. It was this same return to nature on the Mount of Beatitudes as against the pedantry of the rabbinical schools that in part accounts for the exclamation of the people, "He teaches with authority," and this authority after all is nature in its ideal and broadest sense. For it is the God in nature and God in the human breast who in that great Sermon is revealed to men as the Father in heaven.

Another trait of Pestalozzi was his intensely religious nature. It was not perhaps so much after the theological definitions of that day, but vitally religious in the universal recognition of God, his Father's care, answer to prayer, and a conception of Jesus Christ which advanced in ever fuller and richer development to the end. And therefore education in his view is nothing unless it fills the field of morality and religion as well.

Pestalozzi's view of moral education and his method of attaining it is indeed a word to our own times, when so many seem to think that a text book of ethics suited to the comprehension of the various grades will meet at once one of the most crying needs of our present school system.

Morality, according to Pestalozzi, can be learned in no other way than through practice. We learn goodness by doing good. All other methods are like teaching swimming by lectures or the correspondence school. The experiences of their daily life together in the school furnished Pestalozzi with ever fresh

material for holding up to his pupils the beauty of goodness and the ugliness of vice so as to bring them to choose the one and reject the other. They even recognized the justice of their punishment—and Pestalozzi could be severe when occasion required.

Equally significant is his derivation of God-consciousness and his method of teaching religion. The recognition of God he claims grows out of the child's sense of dependence upon the mother. Therefore its development is to be watched with greatest care, in order that when the time arrives that the child begins to feel its independence of its parent, it shall be brought to recognize its need of God and to transfer its trust from the earthly to the Heavenly Father. His words on this subject and his solemn emphasis upon the high responsibility of the teacher are among the noblest of all his utterances. "Here for the first time," *i. e.*, when the child first tastes freedom as the world begins to address him, "you can no longer trust nature." "The world is now the child's mother, its sensual pleasures and proud spirit of dominion are now his God. You must preserve your child from his own blind strength, and give him such rules, principles and powers as the experience of centuries has shown us to be good."

We close with this outline sketch of Pestalozzi because we believe that in him were embodied more fully than in any other, those principles that through the Christian centuries were struggling into utterance. We go no further because the vast amount that has been accomplished since has been chiefly the development of these principles and their application to the world's varied needs.

Great advances have indeed been made. Since Pestalozzi the whole educational system of our own land has been developed in all its wonderful complexity, and has given forces for human betterment to the world. But all that has been done has been but the expanding of the corollaries flowing from the great foundation principle of Pestalozzi, a principle the origin

of which he confessed when he exclaimed, "Jesus Christ is the only Teacher."

Education is no longer a blessing for the favored ones of humanity, while the rest are permitted only enough to serve for their life of toil. It is the right and privilege of all. And our system of free schools is the answer we are giving. The little child as well as the older one must have this privilege in its fullest, richest development. And the marvellous expansion of primary education in the kindergarten (the creation of Pestalozzi's disciple Froebel) and the primary schools is another of the answers of modern educational history. As the right of all alike, it shall not be withheld from woman. And the names of Mt. Holyoke, Smith, Vassar, Wellesley, and others show that we are beginning to recognize our trust; while the advent of woman as a teacher has revealed to her some of her best talents, and man has received most efficient help in a work in which God has joined them together.

A consciousness of the sacred character of all life work as a service has adapted education more and more to the needs of life; it has opened up the fields of industrial training as a supplement to the training of the schools, and it has added the natural sciences, and given them, as well as literature, their proper place in the curriculum, while at the same time the recognition of the value of industrial and technical training has quickened the sense of the dignity of manual labor. And the rights of the physical in man to an equal recognition with the emotional, the moral and the intellectual, has raised the gymnasium, and spread out the diamond, the gridiron and the track.

But best of all of that which Christ brought to the school-room is the New Teacher. The man, and the woman too, who is filled with the spirit of the Great Teacher, a spirit that shrinks not from any renunciation in sympathy with all ignorance and weakness, and is willing to suffer in order that the ignorance may be enlightened and the weakness made strong,—



the man, and the woman too, who is filled with a profound sense of the teacher's responsibilities, and an equal consciousness of the teacher's high dignity and honor, and who in this consciousness counts it a privilege to be permitted to devote talents, powers and life itself to what he recognizes as one of life's most sacred callings—this is the greatest of all gifts which Jesus, the Teacher of teachers is bringing to the schoolroom.

LANCASTER, PA.

## VII.

### NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

IN CAMBRIDGE BACKS. By Mary Taylor Blauvelt. Cloth. Boston, Mass., Sherman, French & Co. Pages 186. Price \$1.20 net.

The sub-title of this book tells us that these delightful essays are "the vacation thoughts of a school-mistress." They were written by her during an enforced stay at the University of Cambridge, England. Everyone of the nine chapters comprised in the volume affords readers unusually pleasant entertainment, stimulating instruction, and spiritual helpfulness. Not often does one find so choice a geniality of spirit and so rare a power of literary expression combined in an author. Throughout, the book is marked by originality and humor, deep insight and ripe wisdom, scholarly resources and sound common sense. One should be at a loss where to look for thoughts on "Friendship"—the subject of one of the chapters—quite so refreshing, suggestive and satisfactory, as those found in these pages. The chapter which discusses "The New School Mistress," abundantly justifies the unmeasured importance, the lofty ideals, and the enduring achievements which are claimed for her profession, and leads one to wish one's daughters might enjoy the uplifting benefits of coming in contact with her personality and under her instruction. The chapters dealing with "The Artist," and "The Artistic Temperament," betray the author's thorough acquaintance with the products of the Fine Arts, and with the psychological principles and qualifications needed for their creation and enjoyment. The chapters on "The Criticism of Others," and "The First Great Commandment," are rewarding studies in Moral Philosophy, whilst that on "Immortality" would do credit to any modern theologian, and, coming as it does from a non-theological source, will probably wield a wider influence in behalf of the truth. The final chapter on "The Writing of History," devoted to what one suspects is the author's professional specialty, is a brilliant and informing discussion of the subject. Had history always been written in accordance with the principles "to set forth 'the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,' in order that we may find in it inspiration and direction, and that a fuller knowledge of human life may make us happier, more just and more generous," the work of historians would be far more highly honored and its trustworthiness less frequently questioned. That Miss Blauvelt's illness at Cambridge prevented her from accomplishing her pro-

posed work abroad may call for one's sympathy with her in her disappointment, but in producing these rich and enriching chapters instead of her purposed work, she has placed the reading public under grateful and abiding obligations.

A. S. WEBER.

**THE GREAT PROBLEM.** By Ivan Howland Benedict. Cloth. Boston, Mass., Sherman, French & Co. Pages 190. Price \$1.00 net.

It is the social problem, in some of its more important moral and spiritual aspects, that is given earnest and vigorous attention in the pages of this book. The author belongs to that large and growing number of our citizens who are gradually coming to realize that our much-vaunted material prosperity is not a sufficient ground for national glorying, and that outward brilliance and strength of civilization can not insure for us the security and permanence of our political institutions. With a forcefulness, directness and courage, born only of convinced assurance as to the truth of what is set forth, Mr. Benedict shows what perils are threatening our welfare as a nation, and points out the way that must be taken to escape the perils and to accomplish the high destiny which is providentially assigned us. His discussions of "The Kingdom," of "Social and Moral Consciousness," of "The Personal Attitude," of "The Master," and of "Saviourhood," are stimulating to thought, and highly valuable for the practical guidance of individual life and social effort. The viewpoint of these discussions is not unlike those of Rauschenbusch and Peabody, but the course pursued in arriving at his conclusions is thoroughly independent, and his prophet-like outlook cheerfully optimistic. Everybody has read the great books dealing with the social problem by the two authors just mentioned, and profited by the reading of them; but let no one suppose their treatment of the complex problem to have been too exhaustive to allow our present author to make a contribution toward its solution of real significance and importance. In my judgment he has succeeded in doing that, and to have succeeded after the others had written, must of itself be regarded a strong recommendation of its worth. Students interested in the pressing social problem of the day will want to read what this author has to say concerning them and their solution.

A. S. WEBER.

**PRESENT-DAY CONSERVATISM AND LIBERALISM.** By James Glentworth Butler, D.D. Cloth. Boston, Mass., Sherman, French & Co. Pages 122. Price \$1.00 net.

In a "Foreword" to this volume its author informs us that its purpose is "to compare and contrast present-day conservatism and liberalism, to unfold these antagonistic systems of thought, and to trace their origin, basis, methods, substance, personal effects,

and final, abiding issues." The undertaking, thus indicated, is neither small nor unimportant, and to suppose that it can be accomplished "in clear, concise and comprehensive detail," within the narrow limits of a little book like this, shows with what dispatch the theological questions at issue may be settled—to the author's own satisfaction, at least, if to nobody's else. The quotation on the title-page is "significant of much" as to Dr. Butler's theological attitude in general and his views, as set forth in this book, in particular: "The disturber is always active, and his audience large. . . . The world does not belong to the disturber and his excited victims, and men of sense should say so in the open." How gladly the hide-bound ecclesiastics of the sixteenth century would have subscribed to that dictum, when Zwingli and Luther and Calvin were disturbing the peace of the established order! How enthusiastically such a pronouncement would have been hailed by the cold-hearted Anglican formalists of the eighteenth century, when Wesley and his companions began to disturb them in their slumbers of religious indifference and social unconcern! How vociferously such a sentiment would have been applauded by plutocratic combines, whose rapacity seemed to be unrestrained and to recognize no law, when within the last ten or fifteen years, in our own land, disturbing statesmen began to call them to account and to curb their ghoulish greed. No, "the world does not belong to the disturber"—that is true. But it is quite as true also, that it belongs even less to those who are suspicious of the disturber and hold themselves aloof from him. The world belongs to God, and, inspired by the wish and purpose of making it worthy of Him, the disturber has wrought and sacrificed, often suffered and died, in the pursuit of his praiseworthy aims. And how great is the world's indebtedness to the disturber for the progress that has been made along the entire course of human history, in science and art, in government and civilization, in theology and religion! Under God, we owe it to the disturber that age after age

"The old order changeth,  
Giving place to the new,  
Least one good custom should corrupt the world."

Among the disturbers of theological and religious thought against whom as "liberalists," our author directs his "conservative" shafts, there are those to whom some of the most important and gratifying achievements in the progress of modern thought and life must be attributed: The originators of "the modern theory of evolution," "the self-styled higher critics who are engaged in the abnormal and impious work of disintegration and mutilation of the Word of God," Ritschl, Sabatier and their followers, President Brown and Professor William Adams Brown, of

the Union Theological Seminary in New York City, Lyman Abbott, Charles Eliot, and "modernists" generally—all these receive the attention of his fine scorn and harmless strictures. One needs not to commit himself to the acceptance of all that the movements and names just mentioned stand for, without being able to hold that they represent that which in our day is making for progress in theological science, and for enlightenment and growth in religious life. A prejudiced cry of protest against this view, such as this book utters, we feel sure, cannot turn the tide of progressive thought back to its own (the book's) untenable position. The book has no vital message for the living thought of to-day, and will not receive anything like an enthusiastic reception by the religious public. Its career will be short, its influence restricted to the small circle of reactionary thinkers, and its fated neglect accepted generally, without a sense of loss or regret.

A. S. WEBER.

THE STUNTED SAPLINGS. By John Carleton Sherman. Boards. Boston, Mass., Sherman, French & Co. Pages 50. Price \$0.60 net.

A crowded thicket of uniformly stunted saplings, among which one rises to a certain advantage of height, is here used to illustrate from a new angle, the principles of "struggle for existence," "natural selection," and "survival of the fittest." The new light thrown by the author's conception of natural method, on the success of "little" men, the breakdown of the "law" in human life, and the basis of sundry current "movements," will be cordially welcomed in certain quarters. In others it will provoke further inquiry. In both it will find interested readers.

A. S. WEBER.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF DR. JOHN I. SWANDER. Supplemented with Selections of His Written Sermons Preached During His Early Ministry, together with Samples of His Philosophic, Scientific and Literary Productions, Gleaned from His Published Works, Magazine Articles, and Public Addresses Delivered on Various Occasions. With a Foreword by Rev. John S. Bowman, D.D. Published by the Publication Board of the Reformed Church, Philadelphia, Pa., 1911.

The author of this interesting volume is known throughout the length and breadth of the Reformed Church. His entire life has been devoted to her interests. With prodigal love he has lavished upon her altars the treasures of his head, his heart and his liberal hands. Various talents, that might have brought their possessor greater harvests of riches and fame, have been consecrated with signal and constant devotion to him, whom in all his labors the author magnifies as his teacher, saviour and king. His name, therefore, in the household of his faith, is the synonym of loyalty to the Reformed Church, and of deep consecration to her genius in doctrine and faith. And his brethren have publicly recognized

his piety and ability by electing him to high positions in their legislative councils and in their educational institutions, both in the west and, more recently, in the east.

They will welcome this latest volume from his facile pen as forming, in a sense, the capsheaf of a bountiful literary harvest. Dr. Swander is to-day the most prolific author in the Reformed Church. Since the foundation of the "Swander Memorial Lectures" he has enriched our theological literature annually by a solid volume crammed to the covers with transcendental pabulum, served sometimes in prose and sometimes in piquant poetry. And previous to the beginning of that annual series his pen did not rust in idleness. His "Text-book on Sound" won the author international recognition, a gold medal, and membership in the London Society of Art, Science, and Literature. His published works on "The Substantial Philosophy," "The Invisible World," and "The Reformed Church" embodied the fruits of his arduous labor in the spheres of philosophy, theology and history. Added to this were the obiter dicta spoken, on various occasions, to scientists, philosophers, students, soldiers, veterans, churches and cities, and printed in papers and magazines.

This present volume is a compendious index of the labors of its distinguished author. The main title, "Autobiography," does not cover its contents. The reader of this review must consult the various sub-titles for a key to its riches. The autobiography is simply the portal through which the reader steps into a busy world. Following the example of Max Mueller, Dr. Swander might suitably have called his book, "Chips from an American Workshop." That would describe the main body of the book in which we find characteristic samples gleaned by the author from his published works. The very nature of this book makes a detailed review of its contents impracticable, if not impossible. But this fragmentary character attaches only to the outward form, and is not at all inconsistent with the higher unity of thought and purpose which gives the many parts their cohesion and consistency. Through all these utterances runs the twin thread of loyalty to Jesus Christ, and of an intense faith in those invisible forces and entities which he has brought to light.

In the first chapter we have an interesting sketch of the Swander family. Speaking of his ancestors, the author informs us that, "it was the most sacred article of their domestic creed that the amen of marriage is always a baby." Thus, with delightful humor, we are introduced to the sturdy Swiss ancestry of the Swanders, enriched, in the author's case, by the Scotch-Irish strain that came from his mother's side. With fine chivalry Dr. Swander speaks of his marriage as the most important event in his history, and pays a beautiful tribute of affection to his wife, who still shares with him the riches and joys of life's Indian sum-

mer. These autobiographical notes will be read with interest by all who know the author. They show us the rock whence he was hewn.

The second chapter contains sermons. They revolve about the divine Christ. It is paying them a just tribute to say that they contain the elements of true nobility mentioned by the author in his "Farewell Address to his Children." They are simple and purely religious. They do not mistake theology for religion, nor do they offer philosophical abstractions to souls crying for bread. In this respect they may serve as models for modern preachers. The next chapter is filled with theological excerpts from many writings. Their conspicuous merit is that they deal intelligently with the objective truths of our religion. The first one is entitled "Ontologic," and that describes the nature of all the rest. Here again the author deserves the most careful attention of those moderns who seem to resolve the objective verities of religion into subjective states of consciousness.

The closing chapter is a miscellany, containing extracts from philosophical books, popular addresses, sermons, etc. The "Farewell Address to the World" on the last page, reminds the reader that the venerable author has lived and labored many years, and is no longer a youth, though his work shows no signs of abating vigor. May it be many years ere (to quote the author) "The Scribe of no renown, lays his last lay unlabeled down."

THEO. F. HERMAN.

THE AUTHORITY OF MIGHT AND RIGHT. By A. v. C. P. Huizinga. Cloth. Boston, Mass., Sherman, French & Co. Pages 40. Price \$0.50 net.

A philosophic mind has attempted an answer in these pages to the oft-recurring question, whether in the struggles of life with individuals and with nations, might is right, or right is might. The author has large resources of learning at his command, and calls them freely into requisition to illustrate, confirm and enforce his contentions. His little book is sober in wisdom, stimulating in thought, and practical in message. It repays for whatever of time and money may be spent on it.

A. S. WEBER.

TRUTH AND REALITY—AN INTRODUCTION TO THE THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE. By John Elof Boodin, Professor of Philosophy, University of Kansas. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pages x + 334. Price \$1.75 net.

This book is an important contribution to the pragmatic literature of the day; but is also what it professes to be, an introduction to the theory of knowledge. From either point of view it is a strong presentation of its subject, and it is written in such a genial spirit that it can not fail to enlist the attention and sympathy of the reader. The author, a native of Sweden, a pupil



and friend of Professor William James, is a clear thinker and gives abundant evidence of wide reading and philosophic insight. He writes, of course, as a pragmatist, and from the standpoint of the practical or pragmatic realist; but he avoids the extreme positions taken by many so-called pragmatic philosophers, sees the strong points of other systems, and presents his own conception of truth and reality with great force and clearness. Taking this book in connection with Professor James Bissett Pratt's "What is Pragmatism?" one has an admirable presentation of the new philosophy, *pro et contra*, with the elimination of a good deal of the smoke and dust engendered in the controversy concerning it.

By way of introduction the author makes a strong plea for philosophic tolerance, believing that "truth is at best experimental, and nothing can be more fatal than stopping the experiment. The most that will be said of any of us in the ages to come is: Yes, he saw a phase of the problem; or he proved suggestive in the infancy of the science." True to the requirement of this plea he writes with clear insight as well as gentle sympathy, with keen power of analysis as well as whimsical humor, and there is not a dull page or far-fetched argument in the book.

Beginning with an evolutionary process of fundamental adjustments, the author insists that from the standpoint of individual development all these adjustments are instinctive or organic, and that the stimuli which constitute the environment, are simply the occasion for calling into play the structural tendencies of the organic growth series, and along the whole line function waits upon organization or the psychological process upon biological structure. While progress in the latter is gradual and continuous, in the former it is discontinuous or goes by leaps and starts. Given the structural conditions for sight, light leaps into being; with the mechanism of the ear we have the wondrous world of sound. Sensationalism and associationalism are accordingly found inadequate to account for the higher functions of mind, and we must recognize three dramatic stages: First, sensitiveness or immediate consciousness; secondly, associative memory and expectancy; thirdly, reflection. Each of these is equally organic and abrupt; it depends on a structural series provided first by heredity and developed by the proper stimuli, and it comes to view at the proper time when the structural series is ripe for it. Of course, they all work together, the higher depending upon the lower until we come to the level of ideals or sentiments and the formulation of truth.

In the second part the author takes up the nature of truth, and discusses, in order, the truth process, the morphology of truth, the content of truth, and the postulates of truth. Truth, the author contends, is the product of the thought process; it is created rather than discovered, although it must in the nature of the case be based on objective reality. It is tentatively defined as consisting

in "the differences which objects make to the reflective conduct of human nature, as in its evolutionary process it attempts to control and understand its world. In this definition, however, the word conduct has a wider meaning than that given it by C. S. Peirce, James, Schiller and Dewey; it means not simply experimental verification, or, biologically, the attainment of certain goods on the part of the organism. "Truth must be measured in terms of the reflective procedure of our entire human nature in realizing its tendencies, formal or practical." Farther on truth is defined as "systematic meaning, systematic experience about the object," or "systematic meaning, corrected and completed in its intended reality." The two points insisted on are, first, that there must be a definite "leading" towards an outcome which is, in the broad sense, practical, and, secondly, that an idea or hypothesis is not true until it has been verified. The author concedes, however, that truth may be forced upon us instead of our seeking the outcome, and that it does not require individual verification to be true, if once authenticated, "whether to God, or man, or a monkey," it is truth and may be accepted as such.

Parts III. and IV. treat, respectively, of the criterion of truth and truth and its object. The treatment includes a discussion of what pragmatism is and is not, which, to say the least, is temperate and illuminating. The author frankly accepts the statement that truth must correspond to or agree with reality, and dismisses the foolish argument that such agreement implies a copying by the mind in the form of an image. His doctrine is that of pragmatic realism. He insists that all truths must work, so as to verify or validate themselves, and thus apparently leaves no room for truths which are self-evident and need no verification.

The teleological criterion of being, the author thinks, applies also to the religious environment. As the mind has constructed for itself and projected a world of ideas in order to meet its environment, inorganic, organic, and supra-organic or psychic, "each of which grades of environment has proven its reality by the necessity of adjusting ourselves to it in order for the highest well-being," so "the soul of man has built itself nobler mansions, has constructed the ideal world of religion, even as the swallow builds herself a nest in order to feel cozier and more at home in an otherwise cold world." But the same criterion must be applied here as to all other kinds of environment. Showing that other forms of religion are not "practical," the case requires a personal God, a God of righteousness, and Christianity, a kingdom that is not of this world. "Christianity is the highest religion to us because it, as no other, furnishes, in the simplest and completest way, that environment of the soul which satisfies and makes objective its yearning for the highest good. And inasmuch as the personality of Jesus answers all our demands for personal goodness, as no

other historic individual does—fulfills them not only relatively but completely—we must acknowledge him as divine in a unique way.”

JOHN S. STAHR.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE FUTURE. By S. S. Hebbard. Maspeth Publishing House, 77 Milton St., Borough of Queens, New York. Pages iv + 210. Price \$1.50.

Here, at last, is a philosophical Daniel come to judgment! The author of this book says pathetically in the preface: “This book has cost me more than half a century of toil and the loss of most things that men chiefly desire. And it is still very imperfect. How, indeed, could it be otherwise, since I have had to cut my way through a wilderness, aided only by the errors of those who have preceded me?” It may be granted that the book gives abundant evidence of toil and trouble, of wide reading, and, at times, of critical power. But the author takes himself much too seriously. The claim to have demolished the arguments and exposed the fallacies of all the great philosophers from Pythagoras and the early Greeks down to Lotze and Bradley and James, and to have laid a sure foundation for the philosophy of the future by the discovery of one simple principle is, to use a modern phrase, a pretty large proposition. More argument and less assertion would have secured greater attention.

The principle of the proposed new philosophy is this: “The sole, essential function of all thinking, as contrasted with feeling, is to discriminate between cause and effect.” This is followed by the corollary that “*a cause cannot be known except through its effects, nor an effect apart from its cause.*” The author describes thought or reason of the Kantian order as a mere medley of innate ideas, or *a-priorities*, flung together at random, no one knows how, whence, or why—having no object except to engender false appearances. Such thought makes room for relativity. But if the function of thinking is to discriminate between cause and effect, the question of relativity becomes simply ridiculous, and knowledge is not merely relative. The author, correctly we think, assumes that causality means more than mere sequence; but he goes on to make it primary and fundamental in every other relation, and thus claims to solve all the difficulties involved in the relation between substance and attribute, the antinomies of space and time, etc., and leads on to the formulation of a “new realism.”

The author next discusses the concept and the judgment, and leads to the startling conclusion that the primary and fundamental form of all reasoning is induction, deduction being only a variety or subordinate form of the same process. Considering the arguments for the existence of God, he thinks the only one of value is that of causation; to cancel this is to cancel all thinking,

involves the extinction of thought. He has only to show, then, *that the conception of a sufficient cause, fully understood, is identical with the theistic conception of God.* In the same way he demonstrates the existence of the soul and its immortality—a process so simple and conclusions so restful and satisfying, that one cannot help wishing it might all be true.

JOHN S. STAHR.

**HISTORY OF THE WESTERN SALISBURY CHURCH (LUTHERAN AND REFORMED), LEHIGH COUNTY, PA.** Prepared and arranged by Tilghman Neimeyer, Rev. John B. Stoudt, Rev. Myron O. Rath, Jacob Reinhard, Marcus J. Kemenerer. Pages 283. Price \$1.50. May be had of Tilghman Neimeyer, Emaus, Pa.

On the third of September, 1911, the Jerusalem or Western Salisbury Union Church (Reformed and Lutheran) celebrated the 170th anniversary of the building of the first house of worship at this historic spot. In anticipation of the event and as a part of the celebration the committee named above prepared an interesting and valuable volume containing the history of the two congregations, with complete records of baptisms, confirmations, marriages, and burials, and full lists of all the members. The work is well done, and the book is a handsome volume, worthy of this historic church, and a credit to its authors.

The history of the Reformed Church was prepared by the Rev. John Baer Stoudt, a former pastor, and that of the Lutheran Church by the present pastor, the Rev. Myron O. Rath. These sketches are not only interesting and important for the respective congregations, but they also carry with them a much wider significance. The authors have gone very carefully over the whole ground, guided by the instinct of the historian; they have sifted tradition, searched the records, and examined documentary evidence wherever it was available; and they have succeeded in producing a work of permanent value. Much light is thrown on the condition of the early settlers and their spiritual destitution, the so-called "Moravian episode" and unionistic efforts, the labors of Muhlenberg and Schlatter, and the gradual development of the Lutheran and Reformed communions in the face of great difficulties. The successive pastorates are described with a good deal of minuteness down to the present time, and the history may safely be commended as worthy of careful and appreciative study.

JOHN S. STAHR.

**THE CHURCH UNIVERSAL. A Restatement of Christianity in Terms of Modern Thought.** By Rev. J. J. Lanier, B.D. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1911. Pages 264. Price \$1.25 net.

This volume contains the second series of the Reinicker Lectures, delivered in 1910 at the Virginia Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church. It belongs primarily to the

inner household of the author's faith, and it has a message for them which is both "noble in its ideals and novel in its treatment of them." It is a new apologetic of things fundamental to Churchmen, based upon their spiritual value rather than upon fictitious authority. This method characterizes the three parts of the book which deal, respectively, with The Church Universal, The Sacramental System of the Christian Church, and Lectures on the Catechism. It lends to the convictions of the author a winsome catholicity and a "sweet reasonableness" which will have the admiration and approval of many not of his fold.

But it must be confessed that the sub-title of the book is misleading. "A restatement of Christianity in terms of modern thought" arouses expectations which are not fulfilled by the author. One should scarcely call it "modern" to accept the Apostolic and Nicene creeds as coördinate sources of Christian belief. Thus, it may well be that Anglican high Churchmen will criticize the book for its liberal spirit, while liberal Christians will fail to see in its pages "the terms of modern thought."

Nevertheless, the volume represents a splendid effort to popularize theology. Though dissenting from some of its conclusions, one must appreciate and commend the clarity of its style, the force of its many illustrations, and the catholic spirit of its author.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

AND THEN? (German title: Und dann?) Ten biblical essays on eschatological themes by Paul Blau, General Superintendent of Prussian Poland. Trowitzsch & Son, Berlin, Wilhelm Str. 29. Pages 125. Price Mk. 2.

IS CHRISTIANITY AS A RELIGION SURPASSABLE? (German title: Ist das Christentum als Religion überbietbar?) By Dr. Wilhelm Ernst, pastor in Enzheim. Trowitzsch & Son, Berlin, Wilhelm Str. 29. Pages 43. Price Mk. 0.75.

These two attractive brochures are good specimens of a class of literature that is typical of Germany. It consists of compendious, inexpensive, paper-bound treatises on questions of theology, philosophy, science, art, sociology and kindred topics. They are written, sometimes by academic teachers of world-wide reputation, but more often by professional men in the various walks of life. A very large number of men, with cultured minds and facile pens, is thus constantly engaged. And their annual output constitutes an interesting and valuable feature of the German book market.

The books under review were both written by active clergymen of the German Church. While the topics which they discuss are theological, their style is simple and clear. The one entitled, "And then?" is homiletic in form and didactic in purpose. It raises those last questions which are of perennial interest to the human heart. Is there a Hereafter, The Riddle of Death, The

Secret of Life, The Resurrection of the Dead, Condemnation or Restitution, Between Two Worlds, are some of the topics discussed. The author succeeds well in avoiding both the vapid sentimentalism and the narrow dogmatism that so often spoil the treatment of Last Things. Read as essays, his sermons are instructive; and regarded as sermons, his essays are edifying. The author devotes his last chapter to a discussion of the resurrection of Christ, in which he presents all the well-known arguments for the historicity of the physical resurrection.

The other book bears a thoroughly modern title. The question concerning the ultimate and final character of Christianity is strictly *fin-de-siècle*. It was raised in the last decades of the nineteenth century, and has become the center of an absorbing controversy. The author of this little brochure does not debate the question whether Christianity, in its historic form, is the ultimate religion of humanity; nor does he institute a comparison between Christianity and other historic religions. He wishes to show the vital difference between Christianity and certain tendencies which claim to be the modern equivalent of, and which aim to become a universal substitute for, the Christian religion. These scientific, philosophical, and socialistic tendencies the author subjects to a searching criticism, which does full justice to their proper worth, while, at the same time, it rejects their unwarranted pretension to constitute the "religion" of the modern man. As compared with these pseudo-religions, the superiority of Christianity consists in the fourfold fact that, as a religion, it is genuine, redemptive, ethical, and social. Sympathetic knowledge of modern life coupled with an abiding faith in the Christian religion give this little volume a tonic quality. It confirms one's inmost conviction that Jesus Christ has put mankind into vital contact with the ultimate reality of the universe. In the Gospel we have finalities which science, philosophy, and socialism must interpret and apply. But none of these modern movements can offer the questing world an acceptable substitute for the Gospel.

THEO. F. HERMAN.

**THE BUILDING OF THE CHURCH.** By Charles E. Jefferson, Pastor of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City. New York, The Macmillan Company. 1910. Pages 306. Price \$1.25 net.

Dr. Jefferson belongs to the Church Universal. He is one of the greatest moral and spiritual forces in America. With his prophetic voice he helps to direct into deeper and purer channels the human maelstrom that surges against the Tabernacle on Broadway, and through his magnetic pen he helps to mould the higher life of two continents. His many books are deservedly popular. And this latest fruit of his study will easily rank as one of the ripest and best. It possesses all the qualities which

have made his former writings notable contributions to our religious literature—charm of expression, warmth of feelings, high idealism, rich common sense, and logical unity.

The volume under review contains the lectures delivered before the Divinity School of Yale University, in 1910, on the Lyman Beecher Foundation. The sovereign interest to whose promotion this lectureship is devoted is the work of preaching. In the past some of our most illustrious pulpit teachers have lectured on this celebrated foundation, whose printed utterances have become American classics on the art of preaching. Therefore, the reader approaches every fresh volume with high expectations. In this instance, they are fully met. The author himself is, primarily, a gifted preacher. And what he practices so successfully as an art, he describes and discusses in these fascinating pages as a science, which less gifted men may cultivate and measurably acquire.

THEO. F. HERMAN.